LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

V. 19, 1872

D. W. Gerhard.

THE

Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE

THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

T. G. APPLE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XIX.—1872.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
54 N. SIXTH STREET.

STORAGE
205
R255
hcp
v. 19, 1872

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I. THE GERMANIC AND THE LATIN RACES.
By Rev. Dr. Theodore Appel, Lancaster, Pa. 5

II. A UNIVERSITY, OR A GYMNASIUM?
By C. V. Mays, A. M. 32

III. ORIGINAL SIN.
By Rev. A. H. Kremer, A. M., Lancaster, Pa. 50

IV. REV. DR. KRAUTH'S CONSERVATIVE REFORMATION.
By Rev. Henry E. Jacobs, Franklin Professor in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa. 61

V. THEORY OF REVIVALS.
By Rev. J. W. Santee, Cavetown, Md. 96

VI. THE CIRCUMCISION OF CHRIST.
By Rev. William Rupp, A. M., Berlin, Pa. 124

VII. THE ELEMENTS AND PURPOSES OF THE PARABLE.
By Rev. John I. Swander, A. M., Latrobe, Pa. . . . 140

VIII. OUR EDUCATIONAL POLICY. 153

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 157

APRIL NUMBER.

I. THE RELATION OF THE FORMAL AND MATERIAL PRINCIPLES OF PROTESTANTISM TO THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIANITY.
By Rev. T. G. Apple, D. D. 165

II. THE IDEA OF CHURCH AUTHORITY: A LETTER.
By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa. 180

III. THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY MINISTRY VIEWED FROM THE STAND-POINT OF CHRIST'S ATONEMENT. 212

IV. PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY. 225

V. MEETING OF THE EXTREMES.
By Rev. Walter Krebs, A. M., Irwin, Pa. 247

VI. CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL.
By Rev. John M. Titzel, A, M., Emmittsburg, Md. . . 261

VII. THE ELVES.
By Rev. R. Leighton Gerhart. 278

VIII. AMERICAN THEOLOGY. 285

IX. DO GHOSTS APPEAR?
By Chas. E. Gast, Esq., A. M. 294

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 318

ARTICLE. PAGE.

JULY NUMBER.

I. HIS EXCELLENCY AND HIS ACCIDENCY.
By C. Z. W. 326

II. CHRIST AND HIS SPIRIT.
By J. Williamson Nevin, D. D. 353

III. THE TRUE IDEA OF THE CHRISTIAN RITUAL.
By Rev. Moses Kieffer, D. D., Greencastle, Pa. . . 394

IV. FAITH IN CHRIST AND FAITH IN DOCTRINE COMPARED AND CONTRASTED.
By President James McCosh, D. D. 414

V. EVOLUTION THEORIES AND THEOLOGY.
By Prof J. S. Stahr, A. M., Lancaster, Pa. . . . 439

VI. THE POSITION OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN RELATION TO CALVINISM.
. . . 450

VII. THE PROPHETIC OFFICE OF CHRIST.
. . . 465

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.
. . . . 470

OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. NATURE AND GRACE.
By J. Williamson Nevin, D. D. 485

II. THE OLD AND THE NEW.
By Rev. Walter E. Krebs, A. M., Irwin, Pa. . . . 519

III. THE SACRAMENTAL THEORY OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.
By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D. 534

IV. WHY ARE WE REFORMED?
By Rev. John H. Sykes, A. M., Martinsburg, Pa. . . 563

V. FAITH, A NORMAL ACTIVITY OF THE SOUL.
By Prof. Geo. N. Abbott, Mercersburg, Pa. . . . 581

VI. THE INSCRIPTIONS ON THE CATACOMBS.
By James L. Ferriere, A. M., Philadelphia. . . . 595

VII. CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCH.
. . . 623

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.
. . . . 637

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1872.

ART. I.—THE GERMANIC AND THE LATIN RACES.

BY REV. DR. THEODORE APPEL, LANCASTER, PA.

THE greatest of all teachers reproved the learned men of His day, because they were not able to discern the "signs of the times." From the appearance of the sky they predicted foul or fair weather, a matter where only a passing temporal interest was concerned; but in regard to historical events unfolding around them, in whose sybilline leaves they might read their well-being as a nation and as individuals, they possessed no power of discernment, no ability whatever to form an idea of their drift and meaning. As history a few years afterwards proved, they were in this respect totally blind, incapable of perceiving the rising swell of a revolution, which was soon to convulse all nations, and in the end extend its influence down through all future generations. They did not seem to entertain even a remote fear or thought that the ground on which they stood was all undermined, and that a fearful earthquake was concentrating its forces, which in a very short time would rend their nation asunder and engulf it in fearful ruin. The fault here was not the want of general knowledge, of culture or re-

finement, for these abounded; but rather the absence of a critical spiritual sense, by which they would have been able to have felt the powers of history as it were from afar, and in some degree calculated the course they intended to take. This spiritual sense, or faith as it may be called, was oppressed in their experience by a disgusting pride, an overweening self-sufficiency, and an inordinate love of wealth, of honor and of the world as it then stood. This so beclouded their minds, that they desired nothing better for themselves or their nation. They cared not to look beyond their own narrow horizon for help and deliverance.

The language of our Saviour, however, implies not only a reproof, but also an encouragement, an injunction, or we may say, a command to study the signs of the times, which cannot be unheeded without dishonor and harm to ourselves and others. It is a rational pursuit; a duty that involves the most momentous interests. If nature is a book in which God is continually revealing Himself, much more is this the case with history, where He has given the highest possible revelation of Himself to man.

Encouraged by such high authority, it may prove profitable to consider some of the more prominent signs of our times, to encourage their earnest study and contemplation, and, so far as possible, to arrive at their true interpretation. The subject, we are aware, is a difficult one. The instances, in which men have failed to explain the meaning of the events of the times aright are so numerous, that we may well be appalled at the magnitude and difficulty of the work. Many false prophets have gone forth in all ages, and many there are in our day, who have become so intoxicated with their own subjective fancies, that it has been difficult to decide whether we should be most surprised at their extravagance and nonsense, or at their want of common sense. But here as elsewhere, there is a right and safe path, as well as many false and devious ones, and he is wise who steadily seeks the right, unappalled by the lions in the way; not he who from fear of getting into the wrong path, takes no path at all.

In looking after the signs of our times, let us commence with our own country and hemisphere. There can be no doubt now that the new world has fully entered the main stream of history, and that it is already exerting a world-wide historical influence. Here then we may make a beginning in casting the horoscope of the great future of history now at our doors.

Next to the American Revolution, our late civil war is the most prominent world-historical fact in our history. Its beneficial results, so far as we are concerned, are patent to all in the new and vigorous life which has shown itself in all departments of our activity as a nation since the war; but its principal historical significance consists, as we conceive, in the fact that it asserted and emphatically maintained the *authority of law, the principle of order and authority* over against the principle of disorder and disintegration. Under this aspect, it is the proper complement and interpretation of the Revolution. It was the right and duty of our forefathers to overthrow the English authority in this country, because it was false and oppressive; but only because it was false and oppressive. It was not their intention to resist just and lawful authority as such, and they were not by any means revolutionists, as the term is now frequently understood. Our revolution partook much more of the character of a reformation in the political sphere, than of a revolution in the modern sense of the term. Still this great movement here in America was regarded with doubt and suspicion, and it was just as often quoted in defense of lawless revolutionary movements, as it was in favor of sober free institutions. By many honest and honorable advocates of legitimate authority in government, it was feared as something dangerous to all true government. It had brought into prominent relief the idea of freedom; but it did not seem to put up a breakwater against licentiousness and lawlessness in the name of liberty. Such fears existed to a large extent even among the best men in this country before the last war. To very many serious persons the feeling of doubt and suspense in regard to our future was painful in the extreme. Everybody felt uncomfortable and uncertain as to the future. The assertion of

a distinguished English statesman at that time, that it was the destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race to divide and disintegrate indefinitely was applied to our political situation, and the prospects of this country and of the world at large were sufficiently dark and gloomy. The war was a necessity, therefore, and the course which events took was just that which the logic of history imploringly demanded. As the principle of liberty had been heroically fought out here, it was necessary, in order to inspire confidence in this grand historical result, that the principle of order, authority and law should be asserted with equal emphasis and earnestness. The two are vitally connected, and the one necessarily involves the other in every healthy normal growth of history. Liberty without law is licentiousness, whilst law without liberty is no law at all, but simply arbitrariness and tyranny, without any valid authority. Had not, therefore, a decided protest against lawlessness been made in this country, such as was evolved out of our late strife, the principle of liberty would have been one-sided; it would have run riot, led to anarchy, and, in the end, to entire disintegration. The foundations of society would have given way, and more terrible would have been our situation than that of Mexico or the South American Republics. This entire western world, to all appearances, would have been rendered helplessly incapable of asserting its own self-hood, and must have fallen into the most abject servitude to the will of European nations. Fortunately, however, this was not our destiny; a conservative principle of which we were hardly conscious, came to light, which brought about a complete equilibrium or conservation of forces. This fact, we say, in itself speaks volumes. It is in the history of the world a sign of the times, a guaranty of permanence in our social order, a prophecy of our future progress as a nation, and a pledge of the supremacy of the Germanic race in this western world, which amounts to an almost indefinite lease.

Here, on this continent as in Europe, the two leading races of modern history, the Latin and the Germanic, have been brought into intimate relations. Which was the ruling, progressing, historical race seemed to be decided long before our

late struggle; but of that there still seemed to be room for at least some doubt. Hence, when our destiny seemed to be quivering in the balance, Louis Napoleon, the corypheus of Latinism, considered the time as opportune for the expansion of the Latin race in the new world by the establishment of imperialism in our sister republic of Mexico. In this, as in many other things, he showed himself an astute politician, and had not the course of events in our own republic paralyzed his deep-laid plan, he would have been regarded as far-sighted, and perhaps as entitled to the credit of effecting a *coup d'etat* here also in America. We know its history, and we know how promptly the idea of extending the Latin race was relinquished, as soon as it was seen that the principle of authority was destined to triumph in the Union. There was no hope for Latin rule or authority, where the more vigorous Germanic race was determined to maintain itself, by maintaining the dignity and majesty of law. The doubts in regard to our sanity, or capacity to maintain order and prosperity, vanished during the siege of Richmond, and at Appomatox Court House; and it became a foregone conclusion all over the world, that this country with its somewhat original character was a fixed historical fact. We gained immensely in popularity and true esteem the world around, among despots as well as republicans. The Czar, the Sultan, the Mikado, and the Pope, respect us more than ever before. Mr. Seward, who has just gone round the world, says, we are respected and honored by all nations.

The destiny of the Latin race on this continent, so unpromising at the present time, is a matter of interesting historical conjecture. The Empire of Brazil is certainly a significant fact; slow as its progress is, it has before it an interesting and promising future; but it is an easy matter now to foresee that all the Latin nations on this side of the Atlantic are hopelessly bound to occupy a secondary position in relation to the great republic of the North. It is, in fact, no doubt, one part of our high calling as a nation, for which Providence constituted us a nation, and gave us the victory over Disorder, that we might serve as an encouragement and a guide to the other nations of this con-

tinent, in their struggles to secure to themselves the establishment of the reign of liberty and law. South and Central America are helpless and hopeless enough as it is, but much more probably would this be the case, if they had not before them the example of the vigorous race of the North.

Still less likely is it, as we look at it, that Latin rule and influence should ever get the upper hand here in the United States. Pure Latin elements are few and insignificant, but they are quickened and organized by the presence of a very considerable importation of the Celtic race, that more or less allies itself to the Latin order of life. Some, indeed, have expressed their fears, as if serious danger were to be apprehended in regard to Anglo-Saxon rule, free institutions and the Evangelical Church, from our Hibernian friends, who crowd upon our shores and fill up our cities. The number of pure Celtic Irish, as distinguished from the lowland Scotch and Scotch Irish who are of Germanic origin, is already considerable, but not by any means as large, relatively, as we might suppose, from the commotions which they make. It is said that at present they rule the politics of New York, the largest city in America, and through it, the State at large; and it is feared that by and by they will rule the whole country through the State and city of New York. We apprehend, however, that the manifestations of danger from this quarter will end in smoke rather than in a change in the great current of history. Our Celtic friends, by their bold strikes up in our coal mines, make themselves felt for a few months over the whole country; so also they strike what they consider good bargains with corrupt politicians in New York, and for a time seem to rule our great metropolis. But their real strength, even in New York, is very much overrated; they do not there count one out of seven in population. Besides, political manipulations are ephemeral, and the principle of Reform, which is an innate principle in Germanic civilization, is always at hand and ready to assert its rights in sweeping away corrupt combinations, whether in Church or State. Neither the Celtic nor the Latin race can, therefore, expect to rule in the United States, but must expect, as a matter of

course, gradually to undergo the process of assimilation. It will then no doubt, prove a valuable element in our national life. The fact is, the wrongs of Ireland will probably never be righted in the old country. But here, in this great country, they may be. There is here a chance for everybody to make a fresh start in life, and it is best for our Irish friends to leave Ireland to the English, and come to America, as they are now doing, in overwhelming numbers. In this comparatively free, bracing, moral and religious atmosphere of America, this interesting remnant of a once powerful race in Europe, may yet unfold its better life and become a blessing to the world.

The supremacy of the Germanic race, as a fixed fact on this continent, means, however, much more than mere superiority in number, in muscle, or in brain. A race is an entity, a power or factor in history, of a very general and complex character. It implies an order of civilization, a system of thought, of ideas and of religion, which it carries with it wherever it goes, and to which it gives a permanent local habitation and name. But of this we shall speak more at large further on, after we have made a full survey of the whole field before us.

The relative position of the two ruling races of the world in this country may then be regarded as fixed for the present, and most probably for an indefinite future. The interpreter of signs, therefore, may be said to have here an open sea with plain sailing. Their relation, however, to each other in Europe, to which we must also direct attention, is much more complicated. There, for many centuries, they have been so closely connected and intertwined, that it becomes much more difficult to prognosticate in regard to their separate fortunes or destinies.

It has been frequently remarked, that the overthrow of the western Roman Empire in the fifth century of the Christian Era, by the Northern Barbarians, resulted in their actual subjection to Roman authority and rule. What appeared to be a crushing defeat to old imperial Rome, in the end turned out to be the most sublime victory over blind, brute Barbarian force. The fall of the Empire in the West, was rather the fall of its corruptions, or of its old heathen form. Everything that was

truly good and valuable in Roman civilization survived the deluge, and in living connection with the Christian Church, it became in reality a greater power in the world's history, than that ever wielded by the Cæsars. After barbaric force had swept away the old order of things, it was utterly helpless to take charge of its own interests; possessing within itself no principle of reconstruction, it had to throw itself back upon the conquered for guidance; and it then exhibited, not only a due appreciation of the civilization which it had overcome, but even an apparent abject subjection to it. So it has often happened in the progress of history. During the whole period of the middle ages, the Germanic was in fact in a state of subordination to the Latin race. What neither the legions of Cæsar nor of Varus were able to accomplish, the subjugation of Germany, was accomplished in the most effectual way by Christian Rome, with its spiritual weapons. Cæsar crossed the Rhine, but after having advanced into Germany as far as he thought it comported with Roman dignity, recrossed it for more ample security; and his successors, who went further and attempted to accomplish more than he did, only learned by sad experience more of the increasing magnitude of the work. Germany, however, was accessible to the spiritual influences of the Gospel, and freely received the missionaries sent out from Rome; so that when the schism took place in the eighth century between the eastern and western churches the latter was more than compensated for its loss of influence in the East, by its increase of territory in the West. The spread of Christianity in Europe, during what is sometimes called "The Dark Ages," is one of the most brilliant acquisitions ever made by the Christian Church, and is full of instruction to all those, in our day, who seek the spread of the Gospel in foreign parts. No class of men ever made greater sacrifices than the early missionaries, who penetrated the forests of Germany and laid the foundations of the Christian Church and Christian civilization on that heathen soil. And never did a people show greater readiness to forsake their idols and receive the Gospel. Almost literally it could be said, in some instances, that nations were converted

in a day. Submission to the Gospel was, as a natural consequence, followed by submission to those from whom they received this priceless treasure. Rome, from which the missionary was sent out, became in the minds of the new converts the capital of the world, a sacred city, much as Jerusalem in its day had been to the Jewish dispersion, and the Bishop of Rome came to be regarded as the universal bishop or high priest of Christendom. Sometimes it is imagined that the rise of the papacy was purely the work of a cunning craft, which sought ecclesiastical aggrandizement, at the expense of an ignorant and superstitious people. Doubtless a worldly and selfish element was at work there, as it is everywhere in history; but it is an idle task to attempt to explain such a phenomenon in this way. The papacy was an historical growth, something necessary and useful in its day. What gave it vitality and power was the deep religious reverence, and it may be, to some extent, the superstition of the Germanic nations after their conversion to Christianity. Had it not been for this accession of the fresh, vigorous, native devotion of the new nations of the West that were brought within the pale of the Church, the papacy never would have acquired such vitality and universal significance. In the absence of such a reinforcement, it would, most probably, after the schism of the Greek Church, and the sanguinary conquests of the Mohammedans on Christian soil, either become subject to the patriarch at Constantinople, or dried up altogether like other apostolical Sees, such as those of Jerusalem, Antioch or Alexandria.

This subjection of the Germanic nations to Latin rule, and Latin Christianity, was, as a general thing, free; as freely accorded as it was freely exercised. Free Germanic tendencies, to throw off the Roman yoke, or to make it less burdensome, were, it is true, continually at work during the Middle Ages, and at times they expressed themselves with much emphasis. In the Church there were Reformers before the Reformation, such as Wickliff and Huss; and in the State, the German Emperors, at times rebelled against Italian authority or endured it with an ill-suppressed protest. But these were only signs of

the times, and had their significance in the new future that had not yet dawned upon the world. They had no sensible effect as yet in changing the broad and deep current of history. The mass of society honored and respected the established order of life as right and proper in itself.

King John of England could effect nothing in his antagonism with the Bishop of Rome. His people all forsook him and fled. Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, was glad to do penance in winter, and to plead for his crown at the hands of the Pope. Such things could not have taken place unless the people, as a body, public opinion enlightened and unenlightened, had sanctioned and approved of it. It was the deep reverence for religion, and respect for Christianity among the Germanic races, we say, that helped to foster and build up that wonderful framework of Roman authority which we witness everywhere throughout the history of the Middle Ages. Superficial thinkers, who have no idea of historical development, and who measure past ages by the standards of their own times, may see nothing in those ages but cunning priestcraft on the one side, and ignorant, besotted superstition on the other. What, however, is this but pessimism of the worst kind, looking only at one side, and that the worst? There is a divine element in history as well as a diabolical one. Christ is out on the sea ruling the storm, as well as Satan, the author of confusion and disorder.

What some are disposed to regard as base and abject submission, during long and dreary centuries, to an irresponsible authority, on the part of the German nations, is now, as the sources of history are more thoroughly explored, coming very properly to be regarded as their just and normal status during that period. It was far better for them to be under Latin rule than under none at all, or to be left to the mercy of feudal lords, or such warlike, lawless, and ambitious men, as the German Emperors often were, who needed to be ruled just as much as their subjects. The Church of Rome contained within itself the elements of civilization, social order and Christianity; and during these tempestuous eras of history, it was the only dis-

penser of these gifts, and the main source from which a principle of order and authority could go forth into the midst of the surrounding chaos. Besides, it was necessary that the Germanic race, as a whole, should be kept in a state of pupilage. Whilst it embodied in itself the grandest and noblest elements which could adorn a national character, it was still youthful and impetuous, undeveloped and not in a condition as yet to take its own affairs into its own hands. Nations and races are like individuals; they have their youth, their manhood, and their old age; and it is just as idle to expect that a nation should spring up into the full maturity of its strength, as it would be for a child to assume the character and responsibilities of a full-grown man. Our own nation can hardly be considered an exception; it is not a new nation, strictly speaking: it is rather a continuation and expansion of the national life of Europe, and it can, therefore, hardly be said to have had an infancy or youth. But with the nations of Europe it was entirely different. They commenced their existence in a state of barbarism, and for them to arrive at a state of civilization and refinement, it was necessary that they should pass through a long period of growth and discipline. Here the laws of human nature are just as unchangeable and imperious as those which control the growth of the oak or the cedar. A warm-hearted philanthropy would seek to wrench a nation, in a day or a year, from the dominion of barbarism and superstition; but experience goes to show that this cannot be done. Refinement is a process, and it must go forward under favorable conditions in the way of a free and spon aneous development, not too much hastened by artificial excitements on the one hand, nor retarded by violent obstructions on the other. This was especially true, as history shows, of the Germanic nations. They embodied within themselves great capacities; but just because they were conscious of such powers, they possessed a high degree of self-feeling, which could not be coerced or forced in its developments, and they must be left to unfold the flower and fruit of their gifted nature in a free and untrammelled way. The process to us, in this fast age, seems slow indeed; but this slowness in maturing

was the pledge and prophecy of something great and good in the future. What comes up in a night, like Jonah's gourd, passes away just as soon. Everything of permanent value in human society is a plant of slow growth.

It was, therefore, right and proper that the rude nations of the north should remain for centuries subject to the Church of Rome. What they needed most was discipline; their wild, lawless propensities must be crushed by some firm authority, and their innate love of freedom must be restrained by the austere presence of law. All this they found in the Christian Church as then established. Christianity as apprehended by the Latin race was characteristically a religion of system, order, law, authority, and it was well that it was so, for it qualified it to be the guide and nurse of youthful nations, and constituted it a stern but useful disciplinarian in the growth and development of European society. It would indeed be difficult to estimate how much the Germanic nations are indebted for their present greatness to the stern mother which guarded their youth, and prepared them for their manhood. It is not at all likely that they ever would have arrived at their present rational ideas of freedom, had they not learned in their youth the sacredness of law and the virtue of the rod. It is often said that their position during these ages was abject, and particular instances are cited to show how much they were oppressed and ruled with a rod of iron. It is shocking, certainly, to our supposed high refinement in this nineteenth century, to read of one German Emperor holding the stirrup whilst the Pope mounted his horse, or of another doing penance barefooted in the snow at the door of the proud pontiff. These, however, are only particular instances that seem strange to us, but which were regarded at the time as significant religious acts. In such an extensive political and ecclesiastical system as that which ruled Europe during the middle ages, there were doubtless many abuses and many acts of harsh tyranny. But the system must be judged of as a whole; as a disciplinary institute it answered its purpose well, as is proved by the great nations of the present day, that came forth from that school. Nations, like individuals need

discipline before they arrive at their majority, and none more so than the Germanic. They have been distinguished from the time of Cæsar and Tacitus, down to the present day, for their love of freedom which frequently runs into lawlessness and hatred of all restraints. With this, is also connected much stubbornness and self-will, so that it is sometimes said that it is difficult out of a crowd to find two Germans that think alike, or are willing to work together for a common public good. Of course all this is an abuse of a noble quality in the Germans. What they needed, therefore, in their youthful period especially, was discipline, so that their better qualities might be brought out and turned to good account. This they received during the medieval period, and the result speaks for itself. It is needed at the present day. No where else is discipline more needed still than in Germany.

But the state of pupilage, which requires the discipline of the rod, must not be indefinitely prolonged in the case of a race or a nation, just as little as in the case of the individual. There is a period when it arrives at maturity, and when it becomes its duty to take its affairs into its own hand and strive to realize its own distinctive work or mission in the world. If, by untoward circumstances, it is not allowed to do this, its growth is violently checked, and it falls back hopelessly into abject servitude to some power foreign to itself. It was, therefore, peculiarly fortunate for the Germanic nations, as distinguished from the Romanic, that an opportunity was presented to them at the right period of time to pass beyond the period of pupilage into that of free and independent action on the arena of history. Such an opportunity was afforded, as we know, by the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It came like the wind, no man knowing whence it came nor whither it went. It was a new birth or development of history; and it apprehended the Germanic nations on that side of Christianity, the side of Freedom or liberty, which addressed itself with irresistible power to the very heart of the race itself. Christianity is many-sided, and its full character can never be apprehended and exhibited by any single fragment of the human family,

such as a particular nation or race. It requires rather all these combined to exhibit it in its full splendor, its symmetry, its unity, its beauty. The Latin race had apprehended and exhibited it prevailingly, as a system of law, order and authority for the world; the Reformation imposed it as a duty on the Germanic race to apprehend it under the aspect of true liberty or evangelical freedom. This gave it a work to perform, and awakened its own self-consciousness, as well as a consciousness of the mission it had to fulfill in history. As a matter of course, it produced a separation from the rule and authority of the Latin Church, and unfortunately, though unavoidably, gave rise to bitterness and strife which have not subsided down to the present day. As a national result, the two races came to occupy the relation of antagonism. It was no longer that of acknowledged subordination, but rather of co-ordination. This, as is natural to suppose, could not be freely accorded at once, and the consequence was, that the strife continued for a whole century, before the question of status of the two parties could come to anything like a definite settlement. It was a dark, stormy and tempestuous period, illumined with the glare of theological controversy, and full of intrigues, but with all, of earnest and manly efforts to restore the lost equilibrium of society. It was a struggle at first between two giant intellectual powers, the one for the supremacy which it had exercised for centuries over the nations, the other for acknowledgment, position, and occupation in the new era of the world's history now looming up to view. After the theological war was over, it then became in Germany a hand to hand fight on the bloody field of battle, which continued for a whole generation, and constituted the memorable Thirty Years' War. With the wonderful vicissitudes of that war, with its alternate victories and defeats, the student of history is familiar, as they are reproduced and represented in life-like forms on the glowing pages of Schiller. The celebrated peace of Westphalia in 1648 ended this strife and in a great measure gave peace to Europe. After herculean efforts had been made for the mutual destruction of the contending parties, they ended just where they

should have begun; each was allowed an independent existence, and permitted to contribute its own part in the service of history. The one lost its prestige as the only ruling power in Europe; the other gained an acknowledged legal position and legal right to become its own master and to order its own destiny.

From the peace of Westphalia onward, modern history began to run in known and well defined channels. The Reformation, which at one time threatened to overrun all the nations of Europe, had been arrested at the line which separated the Romanic from the Germanic nations; the old or Latin Church retained its hold on the former, whilst Protestantism became the inheritance of the latter. But though, in the main, a certain degree of equilibrium was secured, the preponderance seemed to be clearly in favor of Catholic countries. Spain was still a mighty nation in both hemispheres, a terror both by land and sea; France was the grand nation ruled by Louis XIV, the grand monarch, and the House of Austria was still in the zenith of its power, proud and despotic, still wearing the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, and dominating in the councils of Germany. On the other hand, England was then far from what it now is, tempest-tost, unsettled, and still uncertain as to the side it intended to take in the coming struggle for the supremacy of the two great orders of civilization and religion. Holland was just beginning its career of prosperity after throwing off the dominion of Spain. Protestant Germany, divided into numerous petty principalities, all thirsting for territory, and jealous of each other, as a political power, was contemptible in the extreme; the sun of Prussia had not yet risen above the horizon; Sweden in the north, by the bravery of its soldiers under the great Gustavus, in arresting the advance of Latin power during the Thirty Years' War, was a power whose influence was felt, and seemed to promise as much for the future as any other of the Germanic nations.

This was the position of the nations of Europe in the seventeenth century, the Romanic preponderating in power, wealth and prestige manifestly over the Germanic. Thus they com-

menced to run the race set before them. But in tracing their separate careers down to the present time, the historian is struck with the remarkable fact, that whilst the stronger has been decreasing, the weaker has been uniformly increasing. In these two hundred years they have changed places, the pupil taking the place of the master, the daughter that of the mother. The growth and expansion of the one has been followed by the marked decadence of the other. These facts are so obvious, that it would not be necessary to refer to them here, if they were not so significant as signs of the times. The once powerful monarchy of Spain has become a feeble second rate power in the world; the once proud house of Hapsburg only a few years ago was humbled in the dust, and made to succumb to one of its neighbors, upon which it had been wont to look down with disdain; and France, which aspired to rule all nations and extend the Latin name to the ends of the earth, has quite recently in like manner succumbed to the same vigorous power that brought Austria from her once towering position. On the other hand, the progress of the Germanic nations, Prussia, England, and the United States in particular, has been uniform, and they now stand relatively in history where Spain, Austria, and France stood at the beginning of the grand race for empire. The growth and preponderance of England and the United States have been long ago a foregone conclusion, and the more readily conceded perhaps, because they stood in some degree on the outside of the fine net-work which bound together the political relations of the continental nations of Europe. But the apparently sudden development of power in the Prussian monarchy, for which, however, good and solid causes may be assigned, its rapid strides to supremacy and the formation of the new Germanic Empire, constitute truly the wonder of the age; and, in connection with other facts of a kindred character, compel the most casual observer to hold his breath and ask the question, what does it mean, and to what does it tend?

The answer to such questions is to be found no doubt in the end to which the ways of God have been tending during the

long period of history over which we have been passing, from the downfall of the western Roman Empire, and the irruption of the northern barbarians to the present time. Volumes might be filled with their solutions; they are pregnant signs truly, and it would be found difficult to exhaust their meaning. Both the pessimist and the optimist, the bears and bulls of history, will here find ample room for plying their occupation, and each seek to monopolize the ground for himself. The Romanist, the mere Jesuit, must have the most serious misgivings in regard to the future of his system; for never before perhaps was he brought to confront a situation so appalling to his hopes and expectations; whilst the ultra Protestant, on the other hand, will be naturally elated by the prospects of freedom and emancipation looming up to his view, and as naturally predict the regeneration of the world as a consequence of the downfall of his hated enemy, the Pope. But the true Christian, whether Catholic or Protestant, will see both light and darkness mingled in the fearful struggles of nations and people. Oppressed with the revelations of the mystery of iniquity, unfolding themselves around him in the various forms of infidelity and hostility to Christ, he will not fail to catch with eager eye the first beams of the dawn of a new day, as it breaks upon him in the east. The morning cometh, and also the night, if ye will inquire, inquire ye; return, come. Whilst to the eye of faith, Death, Hell and the Grave follow each other in the mournful procession of the pale horse, a white horse rises up out of the confusion, and he that sitteth on him hath a bow; a crown is given him, and he goeth forth conquering and to conquer. Rev. vi. ch.

But to return. We have seen how two great races of Europe met together long ago amidst the ruins of ancient civilization; how they shed each other's blood, when they first met; how they then made peace by the younger consenting to serve the elder; how they again fought on many a battle-field, when the younger attempted to assert its manhood, and how they again made peace and agreed to run side by side the race for the victory. We have seen all this, and we conceive that we may now see which is lagging behind, and which is destined to come out first

and to wear the crown. The indications go to show clearly that the star of empire has passed over to the Germanic people, the younger and the more vigorous of the two contestants. The inference also is, that it will continue for a long time to come to shed its benignant rays over their heads, for the predominance to which they have attained is not something sudden and accidental; it is not the growth of a day, but has its roots in the dim distant past, and is the growth of centuries. The progress here considered is not like that of a brittle reed, but resembles rather that of the oak, which strikes its roots deep into the earth, and then spreads its branches towards every point of the compass, prepared to weather the storms of centuries. From this it would follow, if all signs do not deceive, that the sceptre has also fully passed away from the hands of the Romanic race, and that their manifest destiny is to occupy a necessarily secondary place in the old as well as in the new world; whilst the main current of history in years to come must of a like necessity flow forward through the Germanic race, in channels created for it by Him, who makes the history of the world.

The ascendency, however, of any single race in the history of the world, when fully established, is a sign of vast and far-reaching significance, and means infinitely more to man, than superiority of muscle, or skill in the use of fire-arms. The late struggle between Germany and France, decided many more and much more important questions, than the relative value of the chassepot or the needle-gun. A race, especially if it be pure and energetic like the Germanic, is one of the most comprehensive facts in history; whilst it implies flesh and blood, it also implies a distinct mind, distinct thoughts, ideas and tendencies, and a peculiarity in civilization, morals and religion. We see this plainly illustrated in those grander divisions of the human family, such as we witness in the Japhetic or Indo-Germanic, the Semitic or the Mongolian races. Each looks at this world on its outside, in its own way, and constructs for itself its own system of languages, of arts, and sciences, and, when it embraces Christianity, it reflects also its own sense of its divine

mysteries. So, also, it is with the minor divisions of these grand divisions. History shows, for instance, what was meant by the Greek race. In its plastic hands, every department of human thought assumed a unique and peculiar character; art, science and morals, became characteristically Grecian. Christianity itself, in its subjective apprehension by the Grecian mind, did not escape this moulding influence of race. The theology of the Greek fathers differs widely, both in form and substance, from that of the Latin. On this account, the particular form of Christianity of one race cannot become exactly the Christianity of another; if the latter should have a vigorous and genial constitution. This cannot be done, unless it is enforced in a mechanical way, and even then, the natural elasticity of race, will cause it to react, and in time throw off what has been in this mechanical way imposed. As a matter of course, Hindoostan, China, and Japan, must receive the Gospel from the nations of the West; but if it should ever fully penetrate their inward life, it will in the end develop itself outwardly in original forms of its own, presenting new forms of beauty, and expressing more fully, we may suppose, some part of its meaning than was ever before expressed. To suppose, therefore, that any single race, like the Latin or the Greek, is capable of exhausting the entire sense of the Gospel, so as to possess it to the exclusion of all other races that do not accept of its version, is under the Christian dispensation simply monstrous and absurd. It is the repristination of Judaism, at a time when it is out of time, and injurious. This we conceive to be the fundamental error of the Latin Church, which more, perhaps, than anything else, stands in the way of its progress: it is her strongest, but also her weakest point. For many ages, when absolutism ruled in the political sphere, it was a tower of strength; but in the altered situation of the world in modern times, it has done much to destroy its influence, and to give it a secondary place in moulding the present history of the world. In connection with the dogma of infallibility, it is just now at the present time the bone in the throat of the papacy, which it can neither swallow down nor throw up. There is here a con-

tradiction which cannot be reconciled; for a church, which is the church of a single race like the Latin, cannot in all respects be the church of the universal race of mankind. It may be Roman, but it cannot be in all respects Catholic. Christianity, as a divine life for the world at large, is something unspeakably broader and wider than any single race, and of course much more so than any single nation, as for instance, England. It is intended to apprehend the whole race, but any single race or nation is far from being able to apprehend it, in all the wealth which lies concealed in its hidden depths. It is a mine that can never be exhausted, and contains placers, at which all races, and the greatest intellects of each, may forever dig with profit to themselves and to the world at large.

The predominance of the Germanic and the decadence of the Latin race, therefore, must of necessity bring with them vast and important changes in the religious, as well as in the social and political life of Christian nations, especially in the old world. Old things are passing away, and all things in Church and State must become new, in order that the proper equilibrium in society, may be established on the new basis upon which it seeks to rest. Cæsarism, imperialism and Napoleonic ideas, generally, have had their day; they have been weighed, and been found wanting. The handwriting, which decided their fate, was, we may hope, written on the wall at Sadowa and Sedan. If empires should be needed hereafter, they must change their character in all essential respects, so as to open up the way for the exercise of liberty, and the growth of free institutions. How far it will be necessary for changes to be made in the civil and political condition of nations and kingdoms, it is impossible for us now fully to predict; but it is clear they will be more or less radical, and, at the same time, free, Germanic and Protestant in their character. The spirit of protest is everywhere at work, and so great and vital are the changes now taking place in Europe, that we here in America must here also stop and ask the question, What next? Even England, which, though a Germanic nation, is not without Latin elements, and which a few years ago was regarded as the

model of a free, firm, and well-established government, it is evident now, cannot long endure the march of progress, or refuse to give up some of its time-honored institutions. For the aristocracy, the union of Church and State, with some other things, which have always been regarded as the necessary props of the throne, the day of judgment is fast approaching. With the Romanic nations it is far worse. Neither in Europe nor in America is there a single one that rests securely on the old basis of Latin ideas. They are fearfully tost, and looking anxiously around for help in the new thoughts and ideas that rule among their Germanic neighbors. Freedom, progress, and expansion, are now sought after as eagerly by their people as they formerly clung to absolutism, Latin thoughts and ideas.

But the decline of the political life of a nation or race argues a decline of a much deeper and more spiritual character in their religious life. Latin Christianity, as a fact in history, is far from being what it once was, an all-embracing power, which bound the nations of Europe together into a common brotherhood or family of nations. It has lost its hold almost entirely, upon the Germanic element, and scarcely any longer controls the Romanic. It has shown of late, more especially, its incapacity to hold its own nations within the old order of life; and it seems to be too old to learn, and too feeble to enforce obedience in maintaining the blessings of civil order among them. It cannot at the present time point to a single nation where it has been able to secure to the people these blessings. This is true in the case of France, Italy, Austria, Spain, Portugal, and the South American Republics. It made an earnest effort a few years ago, through the highest dignitaries of the Church, to confer lasting peace upon poor distracted Mexico, and to reconstruct its political institutions on the old Latin basis, but with no permanent or tangible results. Its services in this direction have, in fact, been generally discarded as of no use, and both rulers and people alike, now seem to think that they must take the matter into their own hands, and solve the problem of their own destiny, with the assistance which the new light of history is affording them.

Latin Christianity has had its day, and done well; it may be doing well still, in certain circumstances and spheres; but in the altered state of history, which we have been considering, it is altogether inadequate to accomplish the sublime results of Christianity in the world. As at the Reformation it had no power to reform itself, or to stay the progress of social corruption, and it became necessary that a new form of Christianity, Protestantism, should make its appearance in the world to arrest the tide of iniquity coming in like a flood; so now, more even than then, is it necessary that Germanic Christianity should take the word and speak it out to the world. Its mission or work is to proclaim evangelical freedom to the nations, a freedom, too, that is not destitute of the principle of law and authority, which the old church proclaimed as a necessity for the progress and perpetuity of the Gospel. Will it do so and be faithful to its trust? We may hope and trust that it will be sufficient for these things. If it is not, one thing, in our view, at least, is certain; all is lost, and we can see no hope for the world, or at least of that part of it to which we belong. Not Rome, nor Popes, nor councils, nor canons will be of any avail. Then the vantage-ground gained and permanently secured by Teutonic patience, endurance and power, will be the greatest curse which has ever befallen the world; then the immense stores of wealth, wisdom and intelligence, which it has gathered up in its great nations, as in so many reservoirs, will be a power for evil, compared with which the irruption of the wild barbarians of the North, will be found to be insignificant in the extreme. Better far for the world, in such an alternative, that Teutonic might and power had never originally emigrated from the distant plains of Asia, or had been stamped out altogether by the iron heel of the first Napoleon. Personally, however, we are hopeful. Although Teutonic power is something Titanic in its character, and seems at times to be ready to pile Pelion on Ossa, and to storm the very heavens, it has in all ages shown a readiness to listen to the gentle accents of the Gospel. Numerous as have been its aberrations, or rather demoniacal possessions, it has always shown a readiness to

reform and do better, and its penitence has been of the deepest and the most sincere character. This was its most remarkable characteristic during the Middle Ages, and it still adheres to pure Teutonic blood at the present day. The eclipse of faith in Germany, the fatherland, during the last century, and the beginning of the present, was dreadful in the extreme. According to Tholuck, nearly all the universities were under the controlling influence of neology; and the churches received their pastors from schools which taught infidelity in a scientific form. The religious life of the people, as a consequence, must have been at a low ebb. But from this infatuation, the nation as a whole, seemed to be fully aroused by the judgments of God, as they presented themselves in the Napoleonic wars. After much suffering peace came, and with it reflection and penitence, beginning, as it would seem, with the king on the throne, and extending down to the people. Since the peace of Vienna, in 1815, Germany has commenced a new era of spiritual life, so that evangelical faith has ever since been on the increase. The result of this revival may be seen and read by all alike. With rationalism and unbelief, Germany had no real strength, and it fell an easy prey to the terrible oppressions and exactions of the first Napoleon. With the Gospel once more restored to the churches, with a believing, Christian king, counsellors and cabinet officers, respecting and supporting Christianity, with praying soldiers singing hymns, worshiping God, and taking the communion on the field of battle, it not only defended the Rhine, but overthrew the second Napoleon and entered Paris. Some persons think that all this was owing to the public school system of Germany. It doubtless had some influence. We think, however, it is much more due to the restored faith in Christianity in Germany, to the power of the Gospel spreading among the people, and to German Theology, which, bad as it may be in some of its phases, is the most wonderful, and the most hopeful work of the present century. These causes, we think, had also something to do with the establishment of the Empire, and the restoration of German unity. It is more than likely that if evangelical faith had not been revived in Germany,

and if a new theology had not come in to take the place of old dead traditions, there could have been no German empire, with a Protestant prince at the head of it.

Protestantism is the normal form of Germanic Christianity. We can think of no other. The facts of history go to show, that if the race, in its different modifications, as they exist in England Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Germany proper, and in this country, are to be under the influence of the Gospel at all, it must be under the free form of the Protestant faith, or something better growing out of it. These nations will be free politically, and they will be free religiously. The only alternative with them is absolute rationalism and unbelief. The momentous question then arises, is the evangelical faith sufficient to control these great nations that are destined to control the world for an apparently indefinite period? As a mere system of negations, of endless protestings, as it is so often regarded by Catholic theologians, it of course can accomplish nothing except to destroy; but as a system of reform, embodying in it the principle of renovation, it can accomplish much. It is positive as well as negative, and contains in it the same divine-human life, which in other ages made conquest of nations. In one form or another, in its free, evangelical character, it is, we may say, the only form or side of Christianity, which can adequately meet the circumstances and wants of the times, when papal decrees and fulminations have so little effect on the general mind. Its almost endless divisions, and its tendency to run into hostile sects, is a weak point in its character, to be sure; it is also the weak point in the Germanic race as a whole. But it is not, we may hope, incurable. Recent events have shown that Teutonic people, in their love for strife and diversity, have not lost their senses, and that they have no disposition like the French communists, to destroy themselves. They have, we may suppose, too much common sense still remaining, to commit the Japanese crime. As already said, quite recently they have shown their conservative tendencies, their love for unity, for law and order, both in this country and in the old world. These are hopeful signs, and encourage us to believe that a bet-

ter and more perfect unity of the Protestant Church, is not an impossibility, or a thing at all improbable. When the time comes, and the proper conditions are evolved in the progress of history, it may be as easy a matter for Providence to restore the much prayed-for, and the earnestly-desired unity of the Protestant churches, as it was to bring together the hostile divisions of Germany into a confederate empire. Our present divisions may thus be made the basis of a noble united church in the future, which will be more and more a praise and a glory in the whole world, and not be without great influence upon those older forms of Christianity around us, which seem so helpless in their decrepitude, but which show, also, earnest longings to renew their youth like the eagle.

The manifest ascendency of Germanic thoughts and ideas, of Germanic faith, art, science, and religion in the world, is, as we have seen, a historical result. It is also the result of God's ways in history; and it is, no doubt, the best for the moral order of the world's history. Cæsarism and Latinism may have their good side, and be very useful in their time and place; but they have a dark side also. They are blood-thirsty and aggressive, and deal largely in war and carnage; they imply, also, deceit, cunning, and intrigue, and an inordinate propensity for lying, as recent events have abundantly shown. The Germanic nations, on the other hand, are much more peaceful in their tendencies; more fond of industry and toil, and they are less aggressive, and usually on the defensive in war; they are also much more honest and truth-telling in their words and actions. We may hope, therefore, that the Germanic ascendency in the world, will tend greatly to promote peace on earth and good will towards men.

This position of affairs also is the best omen for the Latin nations and Latin Christianity. Deprived, as they now appear to be, of the power to disturb the peace of the world, they will be under the necessity of accommodating themselves to their altered circumstances, and learn wholesome lessons from history and the signs of the times. It is not likely that another Napoleon will ever be able to disquiet the peace of the world by a

single sentence in a new year's speech. Latin Christianity will not be without a useful purpose in the world. It contains elements which Protestantism may study with profit and advantage. But its salvation and preservation under the divine guidance will depend much on the presence and healthful influence of the Evangelical Church, from which it may also learn some useful lessons. The historian, Ranke, has shown that, whilst the Church of Rome could effect no reformation before the Protestant reformation, it did experience a counter-reformation, which was felt throughout its entire extent after Protestantism had once become an established fact. The morals of the Papal Court were improved and an earnest struggle was inaugurated by the society of Jesus to promote greater purity of morals among the clergy and the people. In like manner, we may hope, that the superior intelligence and moral purity, with the Christian activity of the Protestant nation, will not be without their influence in elevating Catholic nations and Catholic Churches. We may see a beginning of this process here in our own country and in Germany, where Catholics have been vastly improved by contact with Protestants.

In view of these facts, we would conclude that the great battle between the great Germanic and the Latin races has been to all intents and purposes fought out, and that the way is now gradually being opened by Providence for the restoration of peaceful relations. Whilst collisions must be expected to occur now and then all over the world, there is room now more than ever before for both to pursue an irenic course toward each other. Whilst the points of difference cannot be honestly overlooked or ignored, it is time to consider the points of agreement. These are many, and all of the most fundamental character. Catholics and Protestants believe alike in the Trinity, and both adore the same divine-human Saviour, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. It would be wise, therefore, in their heated controversies to bear this in mind, and to ask the question, whether they ought not to combine their energies in resisting the various forms of infidelity and unbelief, which threaten to come in like a flood, to destroy both Catholic and Protestant Churches. A conscious-

ness of unity in many of the fundamental truths of divine revelation will help very much to prepare the way in time to come for the inward reconciliation of these two great races, and with it, their systems of faith.

In conclusion, we would say, that we have reason to rejoice, and be glad that we belong to that great race or family of nations, upon whose shoulders is being placed by the hand of Providence itself, the government of the world and the formation of history. The German name is becoming more and more an honor among the nations. We should, therefore, prize it ourselves so much the more, and strive to be true to what it implies. It embodies the highest order of civilization, the highest flights of art, the profoundest depths of philosophy and the freest forms of Christianity. So too, there is a margin amidst the dark and tumultuating scenes of history, through which we are passing, for us to be hopeful. Amidst the disorder and confusion of the present, threatening at times the decay and dissolution of society, there is ground for the hope of a bright and glorious future. A vigorous hand is on the helm of the world's grand movements. If the old order of things is passing away, the new and the free is taking its place. The one order of civilization will be a prop and support for the other, and their ultimate inward reconciliation cannot be considered altogether as an impossibility or an absurdity. We may hope for it in that wide area of freedom, which German thoughts and German Christianity have opened up to the view of the world.

ART. II.—A UNIVERSITY OR A GYMNASIUM?*

It may, perhaps, not be out of place on an occasion like this, when we meet amid the haunts of our early life, where we made our first acquaintance with the sages of antiquity, and learned wisdom from the lips of venerable and venerated sages of the present, to sit down calmly and soberly to the consideration of a subject, which, while it may have in it more of reality than of poetry, may enable us to carry away with us more than spirits rejuvenated and refreshed for the long day of toil in which each of us is trying to do a man's work. It may be well, perhaps, to remember, that Helicon had its pure air for the invigoration of the body, as well as the divine breath of the Muses for the inspiration of the soul; that its abundant waters, its fertile valleys, the goodness of its shades, and the beauty of its venerable trees, ministered to the physical wants of some child of nature, as well as to the soul of the select few whom the gods delighted to honor; that even Castalia was overshadowed by the humble fig tree, as well as by the ivy. Let us then, in this season of rejoicing and hearty greeting, turn aside for a moment to the consideration of a subject in which we, of all men, should cherish an interest, remembering that as we have been admitted to great privileges, so are also great duties imposed upon us; and, though amid the wear and tear of the humble calling in which we have found our sphere of action, we have nothing new to offer to minds accustomed to meditate in the hush and quiet of the study, still we may venture to speak an earnest word to you as well as to ourselves.

* Address delivered before the Alumni Society of Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster on Wednesday evening, June 28, 1871, by C. V. Mays, A.M. Published by request of the Society.

The subject of *secondary* and *higher* instruction for the last few years has been occupying the mind of the educated public quite as fully as at any previous period. On the continent of Europe the system of higher education has been well defined and settled, and, in some states at least, the salutary laws regulating the education of the masses have brought about most surprising and most commendable results. In England, a country proverbially slow in its reforms, the subject of a more thorough education of the masses is under consideration now, and from the work already done, and the character of the men engaged in it, it, too, in its own time will place itself in the vanguard of nations with reference to its educational institutions. But, while the government is devising means for the more general education of its masses, a struggle is going on in reference to its secondary and higher instruction. Its great public schools, such as Harrow, Rugby, &c., which prepare for Oxford and Cambridge, and which educate the middle and higher classes, are, in some respects, found sadly deficient; and are, moreover, meeting with much opposition from those who are considered the champions of the claims of the Natural Sciences. This conflict has to a certain extent affected us in our attempts at a higher education. The opposition against the existing course of study now generally pursued in our colleges has received a new impetus, and all through the land we find colleges and academies falling in with this spirit, and making provision for those studies which are fancied as having a more direct bearing upon the practical wants of our educated men. The idea of *general* training has, for the moment, given place to special preparation to the wants of life.

It is not our intention to add anything to what has been said so often, as to the comparative usefulness of this or that branch of study; nor do we think that this question concerns us near so much, as that, whether we are using our best efforts to perfect the system which we have adopted, and which we believe best adapted to higher education in its true and full sense. The studies to be pursued during a collegiate course; the time

that should be alloted to the classics, mathematics, and natural sciences; their comparative merit as furnishing means for intellectual development, are questions pretty well settled among us, and this college has, least of all, little to fear from that utilitarian spirit which sees the intrinsic value of education only in the price it brings in the markets of the world. Let us see whether, as an institution of the Church, she has nothing to fear from another direction. Let us inquire somewhat into the system of instruction preparatory to a collegiate course as it is furnished in this country; and, while our American Colleges, some with a laudable ambition, others with a foolish vanity, are striving to realize the idea of an American University, let us see whether they have counted the cost of their building, and whether they are taking care to lay a broad foundation for so lofty an edifice. Let us compare our system of secondary instruction—or rather the absence of a system—with that of the older nationalities of Europe. Let us inquire into the character and influence of the Lycées of France, the Gymnasia of Germany and even the great public schools of England, and see whether in our efforts to realize our idea of higher education we may not have something to learn from them. Let us be candid with ourselves as a brotherhood of liberally educated men should be. Let us not talk of a university until we have at least made some provision for training preparatory to a university course, lest, unhappily, we may be found, like the mad old king, to sway a sceptre, vainly imagining that we possess a realm. Let us not long for impossibilities, and neglect to avail ourselves of that which is within our reach. Let us, above all, bring to the work in our search after truth the spirit of which Socrates speaks, when he says, "I am one of those who would gladly be refuted if I say anything that is not true, and gladly refute another who is in error; but of the two, would rather be refuted, inasmuch as it is a greater gain to be oneself delivered from the greatest of all evils, than to be the means of deliverance to another." Let us do these things, and we shall see clearly what is our duty,

and in what way, and to what extent we can aid in organizing the secondary education of our country.

The great want in our American higher education is a system of well-organized academies, or preparatory schools. So long as those bodies which have the exclusive charge of the collegiate education, do not found preparatory schools, endow them, furnish them with a corps of teachers trained and fitted for the service, and establish a thorough, uniform and comprehensive course of study, just so long may our colleges expect to come short of realizing their idea of growing into anything higher than they are at present; just so long may they expect to be compelled to admit, year after year, the same discordant element, badly prepared even in those branches upon which most stress is laid, and wholly incapable to profit, in an eminent sense, from the instruction given in the higher departments of philosophy and general literature. The fact is notorious that the majority of college students are not prepared to receive instruction in any higher form than is now given by our colleges. The ground work, or drill, whether in the classics, mathematics or natural sciences, must be performed somewhere in order that these studies may be enjoyed in their higher relations, and if it is not attainable in the preparatory school, it must be performed by the college, and in just the measure in which it does this will it be prevented from rising any higher. We fail, therefore, in our higher education, because we have no properly organized plan, no well-established course of study, uniform throughout the land, and imperative upon all who knock for admittance into the college. The college curriculum must always adapt itself to the average standard of the class, and where this is low, it must spend a large part of its four years' course in laying the foundation that should have been laid in the preparatory school.

Under such circumstances both students and professors must suffer. Teaching is too often a narrowing process, and the stimulus that causes a professor to grow in his sphere, and which enkindles the enthusiasm, without which there can be no sympathy between teacher and taught, can never find place

where he must come down to the laborious, grinding process of drilling in the rudiments students who have already passed the age for such work. The work of a professor of a college and that of teacher of a preparatory course can never be successfully performed by the same person. There is a time, too, in the years of a young man's education when the foundation must be laid, and this cannot be done if he is taken out of his proper relations and introduced into the freedom of college life. There is a time, moreover, in the years of a young man's *life*, when he is best fitted for the drill peculiar to the basis of sound training. But this training must begin, not in college, but in the preparatory school, and earlier in life than the period at which young men enter college. The average age last year of the Freshmen class of Harvard was *eighteen*, within *one* year the age of the German student, when he leaves the Gymnasia for the University; but who has, by this time, gone through a course of classical reading equal to that of our colleges, while in the study of mathematics and natural history he is not farther behind our graduates, than he surpasses them in the knowledge of the mother tongue and the modern languages; but at this point the comparison ends. While the one enters upon a course of most liberalizing studies in connection with the university, and under the direction of the best teachers the world has ever produced; the other begins his special course looking directly to one of the professions, or, as is too often the case, lays aside his studies forever. It is evident that those of our American colleges which are attempting to introduce university studies into their upper classes with such materials as they have, must in the end fail. The German student begins to make his studies elective after the most thorough and systematic training, extending through nine years of the most suitable part of his life; and he emerges from it with a mind so disciplined, and with powers so matured, that he is prepared to make the very best use that can be made of the scholarship and erudition with which he meets at the university. It must be patent to every one who has for any length of time been connected with our educational institutions, that

the failures, the disheartening, which turns thousands back from the work begun with such ardent hopes, and the imperfect training of thousands more who complete their course, are due, mainly to the inadequate preparation before entering college. The habits of the student are not formed so much during his collegiate, as in his preparatory course. The enthusiasm which lasts is enkindled when he feels the delight of his first triumphs, and the habits of patient, persevering, persistent effort are formed when he meets with his first difficulties. The great want, therefore, in our American colleges is not that they are not well-manned, nor that the curriculum of studies is inadequate; but it is due to the fact that there are among us no well-organized, efficient, and authoritative preparatory schools. Let us listen to the opinions of some of those men who are best fitted by education and experience to judge in this matter.

The late Prof. Thiersch says, that the great want of England and America is an organized system of secondary schools, and that we can never have a successful higher instruction until these are provided. Here is the testimony of one whose great learning and intimate connection with the German universities enabled him to judge correctly, what were the means by which they acquired their distinction; and these means he found in the splendidly organized Gymnasia, which furnished, first of all, the proper material.

Prof. Stanton says, "If there must be a defect in any part, let it be in the superstructure. I do not hesitate to utter as my deliberate and matured conviction that more importance should be attached to the preparatory than to the collegiate course of study. I mean that the destiny of the student, and of the world through him, is more affected by the preparatory course. A failure in this is wont to be so fatal, so irretrievable that no pains should be spared to avoid it."

Prof. Porter, whose long connection with one of the oldest and most successful of our New England colleges adds, that he believes it to be true, that if the tens of millions of dollars that have been wasted, and worse than wasted in founding and

equipping superfluous colleges and pretended universities in this country, had been bestowed in endowing and equipping a large number of classical schools of the highest order, the colleges themselves and the higher education of the country would long ago have been lifted into a higher position.

These are the opinions of men who have made the subject of education a life-long study, and who have had perhaps as good an opportunity for forming a correct judgment as any set of men connected with the work of education.

And now, let us see, for a moment, what is the character of the schools upon which the colleges must depend for their material. The fault, in the first place, is not that there are too few of them—their name is legion, and they exist under all possible names, and hold out all possible inducements as bids for the patronage of the public. Thus we have Classical schools, Mathematical schools, Scientific schools, English schools, Business and Commercial schools, colleges for boys, schools where learning is made easy and where pupils may hope to be entertained as well as instructed, and so on to the end of the chapter—anything but a uniform system, founded upon the best experience of the best minds of all ages. Under this perfect freedom, and the absence of any law regulating the establishment of schools, the work of teaching must necessarily often fall into the hands of unworthy men, who look upon it as a mere business, and with an eye exclusively to the profits. This is the great temptation in the way of those who enter upon the work with good and praise-worthy intentions. It is also a temptation to others who have no such intentions, but who enter the profession solely as a business speculation. The object of such men is to fill their schools to the utmost, and the teaching that is done, consists only in spending so many hours in hearing recitations that have been committed to memory in what the pupils are pleased to call their study hours. Such schools are, of course, popular. There is no prescribed course, nothing obligatory, but perfect freedom to select whatever may suit the taste or fancy; the severity of discipline is dispensed with, and in its stead entertainment is

furnished by way of lectures and brilliant experiments. There is thus a kind of a royal road to learning, ending, no one knows where, except it be, where all at once the school-boy finds himself a young gentleman.

And where shall we seek for models upon which to found a reform in the secondary education of this country? Evidently in that country where the subject has received the most earnest attention; where time has made something like perfection possible, and where the most generous means were at hand for making trial of the plan adopted. The Gymnasia of Germany and those of Prussia, particularly, are without doubt the best in the world, while the Lycees of France are not much behind them in point of excellence. The public schools of England, excellent as they are with all their splendid foundations, cannot in all respects compare favorably with these schools on the continent, because they adhere too rigidly to the traditions of the past. By what means, and in what respect do they accomplish so much more for the higher education of the people than the academies and high schools of this country? A glance at their history and plan of work will readily answer this question.

In the year 1808, the great epoch for reform in the higher schools of Prussia, when William von Humboldt was at the head of the educational department, and when a proposal was made not to require Greek except from students for orders, he made this memorandum: "Es ist nicht darum zu thun, dass Schulen und Universitäten in einem trägen und kraftlosen Gewohnheits-gange bleiben, sondern darum, dass durch sie die Bildung der Nation auf eine immer höhere stufe gebracht werde." And this may be taken as the motto of his whole administration of public instruction. Indeed, it was the recognition of this principle on the part of the state that has enabled Prussia to distance all countries in perfecting a system ot education, which embraces within its organization the schools of the country from the primary up through the Gymnasia and Real-Schulen to the University. The educational department was at first a section of the home office; but in 1817 it became

an independent ministerial department. The chief minister has associated with him eight technical counsellors, and these with the under Secretary of State for the department constitute the central authority for the affairs of education.

Prussia, prior to the Austrian war in 1866, was divided into eight provinces, and these were again divided into twenty-six districts. There is a *provincial* school board in the chief town of each of the provinces, and a *district* board in each of the twenty-six districts. The provincial board extends its authority in general over the Gymnasia, the larger Pro-gymnasia and Real-Schulen of the first rank; the *district* board, over the smaller Pro-Gymnasia, Real-Schulen of the second rank, and Higher Burgher schools, and primary schools of all kinds. These boards are in continual communication with the minister at Berlin, and every two years draw up for him a general report of the school affairs of their province or district. This educational bureau directs and controls all the network of schools in the whole kingdom. It establishes the system of instruction; regulates the amount of school work to be done; prescribes the studies and the order in which they are to be pursued; decides upon the qualification of the teachers, and has the power of appointment. It thus insures to the country a uniformity, a oneness, to be found no where else. No school in Prussia can be independent in the sense of owing no account to any one for the teacher it employs, or the way in which it is conducted, since for every school there is an ordained authority of supervision. The power, therefore, that has in its keeping the sacred work of educating the young, can degenerate into no such instrument of traffic as it so often does among ourselves.

First on the list of schools stand the Gymnasia, which look directly to the University. The course of instruction in these runs through a period of nine years, the pupils entering at ten and leaving at nineteen. The plan of work is most systematically arranged and thorough. Latin and Greek begin with the lowest class, and continue throughout the course. The mother tongue is studied in every class, and among the modern languages, French and English—the former as a *cultur-sprache*,

and the latter as a *handel-sprache.* The admirable system that prevails throughout the entire plan; the adaptation of means to an end in the discipline of the powers of the mind as these gradually unfold themselves, and the amount of school work done, are incredible to one educated in the hap-hazard manner of our American system. Matthew Arnold, who is perhaps one of the finest examples of the men produced by the English Public Schools, acknowledged his utter astonishment at the proficiency of the different classes as he saw them in every school of note in Germany and France. To such an extent was he impressed with the system that on his return he closes his exhaustive report with the words—"organize your secondary and superior instruction." What must be said of our schools, when a man exclaims thus to the English people under the very shadows of Rugby, Harrow and Eton?

The Progymnasia are simple Gymnasia without their higher classes. They are found only in districts where a full Gymnasium is not possible, and the tendency always is to develop into a Gymnasium. Besides these, there are Real-Schulen of which there are three kinds, viz., of the first and second rank, and the Higher Burgher schools. For those of the first rank, the number and system of classes are the same as those of the Gymnasia. These schools look not to the University, but to business. Where those of the first rank are not expedient, those of the second are established, having all the six classes of the first, but being allowed some latitude, so as to make a *seven* instead of a *nine* years' course. The Higher Burgher school stands to the Real-school in the same relation as the Progymnasium does to the Gymnasium.

Such is the general plan of the Prussian schools. Some of these wield an immense influence, and are among the largest and best managed in the world. The Frederick William Gymnasium at Berlin numbers some two thousand two hundred pupils. It was founded in 1747, by the Rev. John Hecker, a preacher of Trinity Church, who grouped together several small schools in his parish, under the name of Real-schools. The Latin school, one of this group, at its fiftieth anniversary re-

ceived its present name. In Paris, which has a larger number of students in its Lycees than are to be found in all the Great Public Schools of England, Scotland, and Ireland, there are several, such as that of Louis le Grand, and Bonaparte, which are scarcely inferior to that of Frederick William Gymnasium, either in point of numbers or efficiency.

The first care of these governments is, that education shall not be left to the chapter of accidents, and this constitutes the fundamental differences between them and us. There, we find organization and an authority to control; here, there is none. There, education is patronized by the crown; here, the state makes provision only for the masses, while all the higher education is in the hands of the Church, and the secondary, upon which the higher depends for its efficiency, in the hands of private persons. There, as a consequence, there is uniformity, so that all applicants for university matriculation must come up to a uniform standard; here, on the contrary, a total want of harmony, the Colleges constantly striving, in theory at least, to make the standard of examination high, and the schools, in practice, constantly making it low.

We do not urge the establishment of schools exclusively upon the plan of the Prussian Gymnasia. The ground is already partly occupied by our Colleges. What we want, and what we must have, is a system of instruction that will do the work of preparing students for college or business, as well as the lower classes of these schools,—a system, in which there shall be uniformity in the subject matter studied, and the time for beginning and for completing the course of study be definitely settled.

Well established Academies, with strict regulations, and the means of enforcing them, might make our instruction equal to that of Germany. Without some such system, our schools can never become permanent, nor in any distinctive sense national. They will remain whatever the peculiar fancies of each generation will make them. With no strength in themselves to combat error, they readily yield to the pressure of a highly utilitarian age. The effect of such a condition of things cannot but

be disastrous to our Colleges. Many young men who might be induced to avail themselves of a Collegiate training are turned aside to the pursuit of gain, while the best years for their education are yet before them; and the few that enter College do so under great disadvantages. The defect of our Collegiate system, as compared with the higher instruction in the old world, therefore, is mainly due to the want of material fitted by thorough and comprehensive training for the reception of a fuller course of instruction in the higher departments of learning. It is worse than idle to talk of Universities so long as this defect is not remedied. Nay, it shows rather that we have as yet no proper conception of what alone constitutes the basis of university instruction. It supposes wealth and leisure to continue the course of study beyond the age at which our young men now consider their education finished. "It supposes also a large community of educated, cultivated persons, who love learning for its own sake, and the pursuit of study for the satisfaction it brings, and the manhood it confers."* The great proportion of our young men, who continue their studies beyond the Academy, do so with a view of one of the professions, and we are too young a people, and too much in a hurry after the pursuit of gain to give much time to the study of branches which are not professional. We cannot create the demand for university studies by simply endowing one and furnishing it with a corps of professors. We must begin at the other end, and create the demand in the minds of the young, by leading them up continually to higher and higher levels. The beginnings of a University when it once becomes possible must necessarily be small. The giant oak has had its branches tossed by many a storm, and hardened its trunk by many a season's rest, before it lifted its head above all the other trees of the forest. Let us not, then, foolishly spend our time in attempting to devise means for founding a University; but let us rather lay such foundations that succeeding generations may have something to build on, and that unerring law which makes the supply equal to the

* Professor Porter.

demand, will not fail to furnish those to lead, whenever properly equipped young men stand ready to follow.

What then constitutes such a preparatory course as would elevate our Colleges and make them more efficient? In the first place a more thorough preparation is needed in the classics. The argument for this is found in the fact, that our students in the upper classes of College, as a general thing, read the Latin and Greek authors with too little facility. These authors are scarcely ever read as literature, history, or philosophy, by students after their graduation. The study should commence earlier in life, and the preparatory course should be so extended that the student may have time to master the minutiæ of grammar, and acquire a tolerable facility in the reading of the ordinary Latin and Greek authors. Exercises should be furnished for the constant comparison of the idioms and structure of the language with those of the mother tongue. Every lesson in Latin or Greek should also be made a lesson in English composition. A generous enthusiasm should be created for the beauties of Homer, Virgil, Xenophon and Tacitus. Intimately connected with the study of the ancient languages themselves, and essential to their appreciation is the study of Ancient History, Geography and Biography. The ancient world should become, for the time being, the home of the young pupil. Its continents, its islands, its seas, its historic rivers and mountains, the character, history, and domestic life of the people which inhabited them, should be familiar to him as household words. Here, he takes his start in the study of history and literature, and the scenes amid which his studies are laid, should have an ever increasing charm for him.

The fundamental principles of the natural sciences, also, should be made obligatory in the preparatory school. In the study of physics, the *history* of the natural sciences must be learned before the *science of nature* can be attempted. One of the arguments against classical study, is made on the ground that the study of the natural sciences is undervalued by those who prescribe the curriculum of our colleges, and there is some weight in the argument. In very few of our colleges is there

any preparation in them required, and the time devoted to them is so short that very little profit is derived. A knowledge of the principles of natural philosophy and chemistry would serve as a profitable introduction to the study of these branches in college. This would give the professors scope, by lecture and experiment, to carry their students far beyond anything that is now attempted.

Preparation for a better form of general culture, and the discipline and refinement which such culture involves, is also necessary in order to turn the college curriculum to better advantage. The preparation in the studies indicated, forms but a small part of education. To teach the elements of the classics, mathematics, and natural sciences, is not altogether synonymous with education, though it is included in it. There is too little provision made for that higher part of education, the formation of manly character in its fullest sense, of correct habits of thought, and that vigor of mind which comes from attrition with other minds, and from a course admirably adapted to the wants of the pupil. In one of the most celebrated of the private schools of France—I mean by private schools, those founded and supported by the church or religious societies, and not by the State—in which there are three hundred boys, there are thirty-five masters, one-half for superintendence, and one-half for teaching. Now, what do these seventeen or eighteen masters do, if they do not teach? They attend to that general culture to which a child is constantly subjected in an intelligent, earnest, Christian family. They watch over the development of character; they note if anything goes wrong; they aid where assistance is judicious; they reprove where reproof is necessary; they encourage the faint-hearted, and curb the wayward and heedless; they keep before the eyes of their pupils in themselves, the best examples to be followed; and they carry about with them a repose and refreshment for the spirits which furnish the best condition for quiet, solid, and steady growth of mind and character. Those who have had before them the sons of careful, intelligent parents, and others who have been left to grow up as the grass of the prairie, know how to appre-

ciate this provision. How often have professors to deal with those who "are so illiterate and uninformed in their general culture, and so unrefined in their tastes, as to be almost incapable of taking that higher polish which a college life is fitted to impart to a receptive and refined nature. If the colleges are to aim to become more positively refining and liberal in their culture, they will need youths whose general as well as special training has been liberal and refined both at home and at school.*

How, then, are such institutions possible in this country? We answer in the words of Matthew Arnold—"Organize your secondary and higher instruction." The superior instruction in this country is in the hands of the Church, and in whose hands but in those of the Church, should be that instruction upon which the higher depends for its efficiency? Our colleges suppose some preparation for the course adopted by them, and the question for us is, whether this shall be left to the chapter of accidents, or whether it shall be regulated and made permanent and uniform. The Church must come to see that it is her right, nay, her duty, to establish and sustain preparatory schools, just as she has endowed and supported her colleges. And this, I think, answers our question, Shall we have a university, or a gymnasium? Shall we grow and shoot out branches from the top, or shall we strike root deeper and grow up all through the trunk, symmetrically, beautifully, and in perfect harmony with nature's law?

And now, if the church at large, or if those more directly interested in, and fitted for, the work—the friends and alumni of our colleges—are to take the lead in this matter, how can we assist in the organization of secondary instruction in this country, or more particularly in this State? The question is easily answered. By carrying out the plan inaugurated by the Church a few years ago, of establishing schools under the care of each of the classes into which our Synods are divided. The fairest portions of this great state are ours by inheritance. Shall we

---

* American Colleges, and the American Public.

allow it to pass out of our hands, or to run to waste, by mismanagement, or by neglecting to claim it as our own? The great mistake, I conceive it, has been that we did not long ago see the necessity of establishing such schools as feeders of the college. Instead of numbering a score in each of its classes, it might yearly graduate as many as it now has in all its classes. Some of the New England communities understood this matter better, and the superiority of their colleges, in point of numbers, is largely due to such excellent academies as those at Andover and Exeter. Imagine the effect of such an academy as Phillips' of Andover, located within the bounds of each of the Classes of the Eastern Synod.

It is an easy matter to found such schools. They do not, like colleges, require large endowments. There is scarcely a town of any considerable size or enterprise, that would not bid largely for the location of a superior school in its midst. All that is wanting is for the Church to feel that it has an interest in it, work for it, put it into the hands of able, energetic men, and it will soon command a patronage that will sustain it against all competition. There need be no fears of its success. There must be schools of this character, and the question only is, whether they shall be left in the hands of private persons, to degenerate into mere business operations, or, whether the Church will take them, and make them, by the superiority which it can give them, challenge the patronage of every man who is anxious to lay a good and broad foundation in the education of his sons. If private individuals by their single efforts can make boarding-schools and academies successful, in a business point of view, why should a large community of Christian ministers, with all their immense influence, and hold upon the confidence of the people, by their united efforts, fail to sustain classical schools of the very highest order? Be the beginnings never so small, only let the character be such as to command respect, and they must, sooner or later, grow into powerful influences towards the perfect organization of our whole system of education. And this we must have, first of all, before we can hope to attain to the superiority of that grand system which is the glory and strength of Germany.

Now it need not be asked whether the direction that certain of these schools are taking, is wise, but whether it is not culpable. To attempt to create half-a-dozen colleges, where we have scarcely made provision for insuring permanency to one, certainly does not argue well for the wisdom, as it does assuredly not, for the loyalty of those concerned. That their action is diametrically opposed to the only system in the whole civilized world, which has stood the test of time, may be seen at a glance. Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College! Let us set our faces like flint against all such disorganizing influences. Let our first love be towards our poverty-stricken mother. Let us see that her influence is more and more extended year by year. Let us recognize that the defect of our system cannot be remedied by the multiplication of so-called colleges; but by the more complete endowment of those already in existence, and the establishment of schools, all over the country, which will supply a better material; and then let us ask ourselves what our duty is, and in what way we may give our help to the work. Let us call to our aid a little of that wisdom of the world, when great enterprises are to be carried out, which allows no dissension in its ranks, which determines upon the best plan, and then bends its united energy to the work. Let us be honest enough to acknowledge, that the authority to confer degrees, and wear the title of professor, do not constitute the crowning glory of the educationist; that it is noble to sacrifice personal ambition upon the altar of our common welfare; that it is honorable and worthy of all commendation to be a guide to the young; that it is a mark of wisdom to put ourselves in proper relation to the laws of true progress; and that to found an empire within the domain of letters is more glorious than to win the acclamations of the world for success in the race of personal aggrandizement. Arnold won his distinction, not at Oxford, as a Professor of modern history, but at Rugby, where he laid the foundation of manly character in youths, whose after career at the University gained for him the proud title of First Educator of England. Think you, that Abbott and Taylor, in this country, were less respected for their scholarship, and that their memories are less revered by the thousands who enjoyed

the advantage of their instruction and examples, because they remained mere Heads of Academies? No, true distinction is to be found in the sphere of duty properly chosen, and in self-sacrificing labor in it. The glory of the husbandman is indeed in his rich fields of waving corn; but it is also in the faith that casts the seed into the ground, and the patience that waits for the mysterious influences in the womb of nature, to bring forth in her own time, and, according to her own laws, the full-grown corn in the ear. So must we, first of all, recognize the immutable laws by which mind and character are developed; place ourselves in the proper relation to them; have faith to plant the seed, and the patience to await the result.

> "This fine old world of ours is but a child,
> Yet in the go-cart. Patience! Give it time
> To learn its limbs. There is a Hand that Guides."

Let us take this to ourselves, and recognize the fact that the educational system of this country is but a child in the go-cart, and let us go to the feet of that nation with which we claim kindred origin, and find there the means by which it learned to know its limbs. Let the Church see that the movement inaugurated by it is not turned from its true course by factious rivalry. Let her found and maintain, if she wishes to give an upward tendency to the higher education, secondary schools under the fostering care of each classis—schools which will regard this College as the common centre towards which they will feel themselves irresistibly drawn. Let her resolve that there must be harmony of intention and unity of action in the great work before her, and then she may go forth as a conqueror and claim the intellectual, as she has inherited the physical portions of this great state. Let her above all, have faith in the wisdom of the plan, and give it her unceasing, untiring efforts, and she may soon find herself in a condition to write upon the corner-stone of more than one noble edifice, that inscription of Hecker's, but with a name of infinitely wider signification than he wrote it—dedicated, not to the praise of the King, but to the praise of tho Church.—"*Scholæ Trinitatis ades, in Dei honorem,* ECCLESIÆ *gaudium, civium salutem, juventatis institutioni dicatæ.*"

ART. III.—ORIGINAL SIN.

BY REV. A. H. KREMER, A.M., LANCASTER, PA.

BOTH divine revelation and experience unite their testimony to man's corrupt and sinful nature, a nature inapt to any good, and inclined to all wickedness. That this fact, ever regarded as fundamental in orthodox Christianity, may appear in its true character and proper force, man's primeval state must be carefully considered. Here we find man, the *crowning work* of the infinite wisdom and goodness of the Omnipotent and all-wise Creator. All else was made *very good*, but man, in the *image* of his Maker. The heavens declare God's glory, and show forth His handiwork and power, but not His *image*. The myriads of worlds that swing in their silent majesty, throughout the immensity of space, are at an infinite remove from the holy pair in Eden, stamped as they were with the moral image of the great Jehovah—rational, self-conscious and immortal—in harmonious and intelligent communion with the Deity. His body exempt from disease or pain—with form erect, pointing upward to his glorious origin and ultimate destiny—his soul radiant with heavenly light, and his heart the throne of an unsullied loving devotion, kindled by the breath of God Himself, attest the matchless grandeur of his pristine state. Like the statue in ancient story, formed with such wonderful art, as to give forth the most exquisite and enchanting sounds, when touched by the rays of the rising sun, so *man*, the product of "skill divine," was attuned to harmonious praise by the rays of heaven's eternal sun. Man *alone*, in this cosmical existence knew God and the world around him. He could "dress and keep" his native Eden, and raise to a higher perfection the vegetable kingdom. He could comprehend the peculiarities and purposes of sentient creation, which his reason and judgment designated, by giving appropriate names "to all cattle

and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field." His help-meet, he called "*woman*," expressive of identity of nature and oneness of origin. Even after the fall, when darkness and moral defilement filled his soul; when "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil," he called his wife *Eve*, that is *life*, rendered in the sacred text: "the mother of all living." The different aspects in which *Eve* regarded *her* mission, as seen in the names of her sons, shows the same high origin. Her first-born she called *Cain—acquisition*, "I have gotten a man from the Lord," indicating her faith in the first promise, after the fall. Her second son, she called *Abel*,—that is *vanity*, in seeing her hopes in the promised seed frustrated. Her next son she called *Seth*—"settled," or placed, because in his seed the human race should continue to the end of time, and because from him should descend the Messiah. We have here, even in his fallen state, the scintillations of man's primeval glory—when all was light within, and every attribute of his spotless nature in full accord with the heart of God—when he combined in his being, the earthly and heavenly, in a free personal unity, untrammeled by the other forms of creation around him. As such, he was the sole and rightful monarch of all cosmical existence. The earth yielded her fruits in harmony with his own free spirit, and all the lower kingdoms of nature's entire domain, were subject to his pleasure and use, and the continuance of this original and normal relation, depended upon the integrity of man's probation.

From this it is seen that man has a determined vocation, free and progressive, and not by an arbitrary decree, such as obtains in the fixed and invariable laws that govern the irrational and material creation, but by the force of an agency suited to man's reason and self-consciousness. As man was a law to the inferior creation around him, so he, in his pre-eminent approximation to his infinite Creator, must be the subject of the divine administration. As such, he must be placed under *law*. Hence the legislation of Eden: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying: Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of knowledge of good

and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Here man appears as a free moral agent, confronted with a clear and well defined injunction of his Maker, with its threatened penalty. In true freedom there must be the right and power of choice between two objects; the free and unrestrained exercise of our volitions and desires. Had Adam been constrained to act only in one particular way, he would not have been free.

To yield a moral obedience to his Creator, man must possess liberty of choice. Only thus could he put into activity, and develop aright his noble powers, toward his divine Sovereign. The law of Eden was not complicated but simple, and of easy observance—a law suited to the infant state of man, yet ample for the exercise and development of his vast and godlike endowments, and to carry him forward in a career of continuous progress to a state of maturity, to the legitimate end of a being created in the image of God. Man, though free from sin, was not morally and spiritually perfect, hence the necessity of his being put in a state of probation, and consequent development. His powers, however noble and exalted, must be exercised in acts of obedience to his Maker, not to become righteous or holy—he was this in his normal relations to God, but to advance to higher degrees of moral excellence, by willing and doing the right and resisting the wrong. He would thus be confirmed in the true life and character in which he was created, and steadily advance toward the higher state of positive freedom, when *holiness* would be the absolute and irrevocable law of his being. We must not however suppose that, in such fidelity to his probation, any new qualities or supernatural gifts would have been added. Man in his *essential* constitution, was perfect, but through such integrity, he had it in his power to ascend in the scale of his moral being to the attainment of a perfected communion with God, and to glorify and praise Him forever. Hence, human nature, though created in the divine image, was not entirely perfect and complete. It was capable of development, in a course of positive activities, in will and desire. Man in his native paradise, the cradle of his being,

was provided with all the facilities needed, for the right exercise of his physical and moral powers. But in those holy bowers, there lurked an adverse and foreign power. Some of the *angels* kept not their first estate, but by transgression fell. We are here confronted with the Prince of apostate spirits, who with consummate art and cunning seeks to steal from the rightful denizens of Eden, their holy birthright, and turn their glory into shame. How? "And he said unto the woman, yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." Here is the key that unlocks the mysterious origin of moral evil, furnished us by the unerring Spirit of God, in the record of divine inspiration. On this record is based the terse and well defined answer of that incomparable compendium of Christian doctrine, The Heidelberg Catechism, to the question Whence then comes this depraved nature of man? *From the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, whereby our nature became so corrupt, that we are all conceived and born in sin.* This answer assumes the total moral degeneracy of man's nature after the fall, which is fully sustained also by the word of God and the teachings of the Church in all ages. A denial or even modification of the doctrine of human depravity, has ever met with the most determined and uncompromising resistance, and involves some of the most earnest and far-reaching controversies in the history of the Church of Christ.

Ursinus, the most prominent of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, defines *original sin* to be, "the guilt of the

whole human race, on account of the fall of our first parents. It consists in a want of the knowledge of God and of His will in the mind, and of an inclination to obey God with the heart and will; in the place of which there is an inclination to those things which the law of God forbids, and an aversion to those things which it commands, resulting from the fall of our first parents, Adam and Eve, and from them made to pass over into all their posterity, thus corrupting our whole nature, so that all, on account of this depravity, are subject to the eternal wrath of God, without power to please God, unless renewed by the Holy Ghost." The Westminster Catechism states the doctrine thus: "The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually." AUGSBURG CONFESSION; "Also they teach that after Adam's fall, all men begotten after the common course of nature, are born with sin; that is, without the fear of God, without trust in Him, and with fleshly appetite; and that this disease or original fault is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit." These several statements, and from the most venerable Protestant Confessions, are in their essential features identical, and form a strong and united testimony in defence of this cardinal dogma of the Christian faith, which is clearly deduced also from the teachings of the divine Scriptures. "Adam," we are told, "begat a son in his own likeness, after his own image." As Adam was created in the image of God, righteous and holy, in his *fallen* state, he begat a son, not in the likeness of *God*, but in his own likeness, that is corrupt and sinful as himself. It could not be otherwise; hence this stern logic of inspiration: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." "How can he be clean that is born of a woman?" "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." "We are by nature children of wrath," for, "that which is born of the flesh,

is flesh," "carnal and sold under sin." Hence *infants* must be born again, "of water and of the Spirit," they must be saved by the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," for "God is terribly displeased with our original as well as actual sins;" for, "will a lion roar in the forest when he hath no prey?" that is, will a holy and just God roar in His wrath against our unconscious offspring, if they are not by nature sinful—if they are *not children* of wrath? But is the case not different with children of those parents who have been born after the Spirit, and made new creatures in Christ Jesus? We answer: Nature can only transmit *nature*, not *grace:* this latter cometh not "by the will of man, but by the will of God." Men beget their offspring as *men*, in Adam the *first*, and not in Adam the *second*,—"born, after the *flesh*" and hence, "*flesh;*" —only "that which is born after the *Spirit* is *spirit.*" Circumcised parents begat uncircumcised children, unholy, and *such* they remained, until they received the seal of God's covenant blessing. "We *are* conceived and born in sin," "*all* have sinned and come short of the glory of God." But is this really believed by all professedly orthodox Christians? It has been well said by one in relation to *native depravity*, "that there are many (among professedly evangelical parents) who seem to have no deep conviction of its solemn truth. The doctrine may stand in the letter of their Creed, but it does not live in the active faith of their hearts. It has become practically obsolete, and seems to be gradually passsing away, with some other antiquated truths, for which the enlightened reason of the present age is losing all taste and patience. True, the doctrine is still permitted to retain its place in our Hymn-books; and out of respect for the departed fathers who put it there, some old-fashioned congregation, may like, occasionally, to sing:

> 'Conceived in sin! O wretched state!
> Before we draw our breath,
> The first young pulse begins to beat
> Depravity and death.'

But how many reflect upon the fearful import of the sentiment thus expressed? Why the growing indifference to the baptism

of infant children in some pedobaptist Churches? It is because infants are thought to be somehow released from innate sin, sure of salvation, even independently of the Gospel plan of salvation, that it is held to be practically unimportant, or at least unessential, whether they be baptized or not. And *the real ground* of this persuasion, that they are sure of being saved, even independently of the Gospel plan of salvation, is *the virtual repudiation of the doctrine of the total depravity of little children by nature.* For if Christian parents were deeply convinced that their children have by nature a moral character which disqualifies them for the presence of God, and the fellowship of angels and saints in heaven, and renders them liable to the penalty of eternal death, they would be equally convinced that those children must be brought into actual participation in the redemption of Jesus Christ, in order to secure the one and escape the other."

We have seen from divine revelation, and from the best and most orthodox formularies of the Christian Church, that man, by nature, is so depraved, that he is incapable of any good and inclined to all wickedness—that "the wicked are estranged from the womb; that they go astray as soon as they are born, telling lies." But in this state of moral corruption and perverseness, is there not remaining *some* principle of good in human nature? This must be granted, or salvation would seem impossible. Original sin is not a *substance*, but an abnormal and false tendency—alienation of the will, desires and affections from God—a radical and deep-seated perversion of the primeval relations between man and his Creator, but leaving in man some noble *natural* qualities. He possesses reason and will—understanding and self-consciousness. He is capable of forming high and noble conceptions of God and His works, by a due exercise of his natural reason. In merely human relations, especially as these are connected with this mundane sphere, he can pity and love, and sacrifice ease and even life for the suffering around him. The case holds widely different with fallen angels. Here we have, in the most unqualified sense, a *total* wreck. Not one redeeming feature remains. Just as God is

the absolute good, so Satan is the absolute evil—evil in his substance—not in the sense of a new creation, but in an absolute and total perversion. Just as two harmless substances, may by chemical combination, be changed into a most deadly poison, so sin is Satan's being—his essential element—his only good. He is an absolute negation—a self-contradiction. "*Er ist der Geist, der sich stäts verneint,*" hating *himself.* For him salvation is impossible. "He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar and the father of it." A perpetual, living lie, and a lie *only.* Man though captive to this malignant power, is only "very far gone from original righteousness, and in the eyes of infinite holiness, is inclined to all evil," yet he has enough of his pristine state left him, to make his salvation possible. Therefore, while God declares: "O Israel thou hast destroyed thyself," He adds: "but in Me is thy help."

Our subject very naturally proposes the inquiry: How is human depravity transmitted? It has been maintained as the most orthodox view, that sin is propagated by natural generation. "Original sin," says the Westminster Catechism, "is conveyed from our first parents unto their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way are conceived and born in sin." The Heidelberg Catechism, and the "Formula Concordiæ," teach the same, as holding in body and soul, forming one common human life, in absolute unity. "*Man* is born of a woman," in the totality of his being, soul and body, "which in their ground are but one life; identical in their origin; bound together by mutual interpenetration subsequently at every point; and holding forever in the presence of the self-same organic law." Hence the development of soul and body is one process—the action of the same living organic principle. This of course precludes the notion of the pre-existence of the soul, *created*, before the body, pure and holy, and then at a given time united with our physical economy. The idea of the soul's pre-existence is involved in much embarrassment, and cannot be reconciled with the divine character.

If the soul be *created* sinful, then God is the Author of moral evil. If souls be created pure and holy, and then united with depraved bodies, this would involve them in a *necessity* to evil, a necessity depending entirely upon the will and agency of the Creator. An hypothesis supposing such terrible consequences must be abandoned. *Man* is one of the many, the power of a single life, and as such the whole race forms, with the first pair in Eden, the same general life. It is proper then to say that *humanity* was created good and in God's image, capable of knowing and enjoying the Creator. Man, as one in many, and many in one, sinned, and by the law of natural generation, is propagated, with all the attributes and elements of his true, but fallen life; not however without the watchful and creative presence of the Almighty. This whole idea is expressed in the following passages of the Holy Scriptures: "Behold *I* was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive *me;*" not the *body* only, but man's entire being, body, soul and spirit, in strict organic continuity of *humanity*, full and entire; yet not without God's providential agency, which the Psalmist thus expresses: "I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made." "My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret." But what is thus "*made,*" is made by the power of an invisible law, the power of our common human life, reproducing the life of Adam in its entireness, soul and body together, yet not so as to "blend the *individual* Adam with his posterity, in such way as to lose his own personality, or be swallowed generically up in theirs." The identity is not local or individual, but real and vital, as real and vital as the relation which holds between the root and the tree. Man holds in his own essential nature, every attribute and element of his true anthropological and psychological being. Man is *thus conceived and born*—there can be no dualism—no separation of soul and body, but one united common life transmitted by ordinary generation, from one age onward to another, till time shall end. But it may be asked: Is not such absolute unity in conflict with the separation of soul and body, at death? We hold it to be the clear teaching of the Word of God, that there is no *absolute* separation of soul and

body even in the hour of dissolution. The Bible asserts the immortality of the *body* as well as of the soul—its *resurrection* from the dead. "The mortal shall put on immortality," thus showing that humanity cannot be complete except in a strict organic unity of soul and body. Whatever be the state of the soul between death and the resurrection—its conscious felicity and enlarged capacities, it is not the *complete man*, for man is not spirit only, nor body only, but *both*, bound together, by one common life, and this bond is not absolutely destroyed, in the intervening period, between death and the resurrection, but only suspended. When therefore the resurrection body appears, it will not be a new creation but a resurrection in fact of that body, which, with the soul constituted a proper human personality, prior to death, but in a far higher order of existence than ever before. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body," when the perfect felicity of soul and body will be consummated in God's eternal glory. But how is this glorious consummation to be attained? How is humanity, totally fallen and depraved, to be brought back again to its primeval felicity and communion with God? We answer; By the incarnation of the Divine Word, and man's new creation in Christ. As the *race* fell in Adam, in the way of a real inward organic connection with him, so there must be deliverance in a like real organic way. The Son of God must take on Him a true humanity, "that through death, He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil—and that He might be a merciful High Priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." To realize this gracious purpose of the *incarnation*, man must be brought into vital union with Christ's person. This is called in the Scriptures: "born again,"—"a new creature;" not a *new Creator*, that is, in his essential being, but the same generic nature renovated and filled with a new meaning and power, by its life-union, with the incarnate Word, the "*Immanuel.*" The Son of God in the assumption of humanity, endured its every misery,

and met every demand of violated justice, so that God "might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." But this "justification," grounds itself in the sphere of grace, in an actual new creation in Christ. The Son of God, in His mediatorial work, does not only free from condemnation, but He makes "all things new," He forms His own "sacred image in every believing soul," and quickens its growth by the life stream ever flowing from His person, thus infusing into the very depth of his being, that active force—that all pervading power of His own imperishable life. For this reason it is said, that: "Our life is hid with Christ in God, and when Christ who is our life shall appear then shall we also appear with him in glory."

As then the whole natural life of man is organically connected with the life of Adam, involving all the consequences of the fall, so *"the whole spiritual life of the Christian, including the resurrection of the body, is thus organically connected with the mediatorial life of the Lord Jesus. The subjects of Divine grace are saved, only by being brought within the *Sphere of His life*, as a regular historical human divine process in the Church. The new nature implanted in them at their regeneration is not a higher order of existence framed for them, at the moment out of nothing, by the fiat of God, but truly and strictly a continuation of Christ's life over into their persons. The growth of this life in them forms their sanctification. When they die, their bodies *sleep in Jesus;* so that at the last God brings them with Him again, when the Church is made complete by His second coming. (1 Thess. iv. 14.) * * * It is the Spirit of Christ *now* dweling in believers, that shall in due time quicken their mortal bodies, in conformity with the power of His own resurrection state; thus bringing to full manifestation the hidden life of the sons of God, in that adoption towards which their whole salvation here struggles, and without which it can never be regarded as complete."

---

* Dr. Nevin.

Art. IV.—REV. DR. KRAUTH'S CONSERVATIVE REFORMATION.*

BY REV. HENRY E. JACOBS, FRANKLIN PROFESSOR IN PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE, GETTYSBURG, PA.

THE preface is an extraordinary one. To appreciate it requires close study. By a remarkable combination of compactness with clearness, it affords the reader a general view of the field before him. Every point is most sharply defined in a terse style, enlivened by the most striking antitheses. Whilst its depth of thought, accuracy of statement, closeness of reasoning, and brilliancy of illustration at once command our admiration, every repeated reperusal brings to light new treasures. Many of its sentences are in themselves volumes. These merits with the candor and sincerity of the author, so manifest at every step, and the dignity and importance of his subject, claim both for the preface, and the work it introduces the most careful consideration of all students of theological science, as well as the earnest attention of all thoughtful Christians, desirous of knowing and understanding the truth.

The stand-point of the author is that of a positive Christianity. In these times of doubt and uncertainty, in which a subtle skepticism, far more widely diffused than is generally supposed, is sapping the strength and undermining the foundation of all the churches, to many faith has become almost synonymous with opinion, and to believe is scarcely more than to conjecture. Their system, if such it may be called, is one of mere negation. There is no part of God's revealed will about which they are absolutely sure; there are no inferences from it, which they are willing to affirm as positively true. The word of God becomes only an inspirer of hope, instead of a ground of confidence. They trust rather in a subjective emotionalism, than in the objective reality of the great truths of the Gospel.

* The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, as represented in the Augsburg Confession, and in the History and Literature of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., Norton Professor of Philadelphia. J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1871. 8vo. Pp. xviii. 840.

Faith thus having lost its power, as "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," is easily modified or surrendered, as the suggestions of expediency, or the calls of a false courtesy may demand. But faith which is not sure of the object upon which it rests, is in no way entitled to the name of faith. True faith knows what it believes; and to this it clings with a grasp which cannot be sundered. It not only unhesitatingly declares that to be true which it knows to be true; but also lives and acts as if its object were to it a constantly present reality. Jealous for the truth, it shuns all disguises, and in all things seeks after clearness, definiteness, certainty. It is in this spirit that the work before us is written. Even those who may differ widely from it, cannot fail to recognize in the moderation of its tone, and the kindliness of its manner, the modesty of true Christian scholarship. Yet the distinctness with which the author sets forth the theological position of his Church, the confidence with which he avows it as absolute truth, and the candor with which he exposes and attacks the divergencies of other forms of Protestantism, are such as might bring upon him the charge of Dogmatism, were his work less thoroughly pervaded by the spirit of the Divine word, or his statements supported by weaker evidence. As it is, the array of learning and marks of conscientious care which stand before him on every page, forbid the student who has any anxiety to learn truth, or any respect for scholarship, thus lightly to dismiss the volume, until by careful study of its pages he satisfy himself of its errors. The author recognizes the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century as separating into two tendencies, the Radical and the Conservative; the former represented by the Reformed Churches, and the latter by the Lutheran Church. A mediating tendency is found in the Church of England, aptly called the Eclectic Reformation, the weakness and strength of which are trenchantly portrayed in a passing notice of about three pages. The design of the book is not to treat of any doctrine which is held in common by the Protestant churches, but simply to set forth and defend those of the Conservative Reformation of the Lutheran Church, from which the Radical element, represented

by the Reformed churches, diverged. Its sphere is distinctive Lutheranism, as opposed to Zwinglianism and Calvinism. Here it comes in conflict with another tendency, largely operating in Modern Christianity. From many quarters the plea meets us, Let us give importance only to those doctrines upon which Protestantism is a unit, and ignore those upon which it is divided.

Such a suggestion, when urged upon the Evangelical Lutheran Church, is simply presumptuous. As the mother Church of the Reformation, she has never attempted any other office than that of setting forth what she has believed to be the pure doctrine of God's Word. In her earliest public confession, she has distinctly declared that, in this faith the universal Church, in its purity, is a unit. The charge of Sectarianism can never be brought against her. Her efforts have always been directed not to a sundering of herself from any part of Christendom, but, on the contrary, to a union with all ages and forms of pure Christianity. This charge so often brought forward to silence her voice, when she asserts the doctrines which she values, not because they are Lutheran, but because they are Christian and Scriptural, must in all justice be returned upon her assailants. If the unity of the Christian Church be a matter of such great importance, let them learn what the oldest form of Protestantism teaches and the greatest number of Protestants believe. Let them test by the Word of God the doctrines thus learned, and then, if such be their conviction, they may declare the points in which the Conservative Reformation failed, and show reason why they feel themselves constrained to perpetuate the schism of Protestantism by their separation from the Church of the Reformation. Absolute silence is suspicious. Truth always seeks the light. The more fairly the questions at issue are met, the nearer will the different portions of the Church approach each other. As a guide therefore in all thorough investigation, this volume will be an important aid in the work of effecting the true unity of the Church.

But the question presents a more serious aspect. It implies the demand to ignore any portion of our faith, in reference to

which any one who claims to be a Protestant, may choose to differ with us. Any dissent from the doctrines of the Conservative Reformation must be honored with silence on the part of their adherents, while the dissenter is free to prosecute his attacks with all his power! Even if doctrine were a mere matter of human expediency, or individual courtesy, such a request would be hard to bear. Much more so is it, when we consider that the sphere of faith is not one of human choice, but of Divine revelation. There is in fact no limit to the duty of the individual in believing and confessing divine truth. That faith is unworthy of the name, which is willing to cherish only the minimum of truth, by which any soul has been brought to salvation, and treats as unimportant and insignificant all else that God has deemed necessary to reveal. Some doctrines may be less important than others. They may be more remote from the centre of faith, and thus may be unknown to many true Christians, or may even be denied or assailed by heirs of salvation. Yet, as every truth of Revelation rests upon the same ground, and all stand or fall together, provided the objector understand aright his position and the consequences of his reasoning, there is no point of God's revealed will which when attacked or disbelieved does not become a matter of the utmost importance. If the Evangelical Lutheran Church were uncertain of the truth of her position she might be silent, but firmly convinced that she stands upon the immovable foundation of the Divine Word, she cannot do otherwise than proclaim it. Her distinguishing doctrines are the outworks of Protestantism. These undermined or destroyed, the ruin of the whole must follow. No position is more clearly shown in this volume, than that the course of Radicalism is from Zwinglianism to Arminianism, Rationalism and Unitarianism, Calvinism, so far as it departed from Zwinglianism, being regarded as a Lutheranizing tendency. It must therefore be likewise true, that in proportion as the principles of the Lutheran Church are widely diffused, will the unity of the Church and the ultimate end of Christianity be attained. In this faith our author has written. He has clearly stated his

position: "That communion confesses itself a sect, which aims at no more than abiding as one of a number of equally legitimated bodies. That communion which does not believe in the certainty of the ultimate acceptance of its principles in the whole world, has not the heart of a true Church. That which claims to be Catholic *de facto*, claims to be Universal *de jure.*"

Some may regret that the author has not prepared a complete system of Theology, that the faith of the Conservative Reformation might be seen in its fulness, and the various doctrines be viewed in their connection with those upon which the churches of Evangelical Protestantism are agreed. But whilst such a work from Dr. Krauth would supply a great want in the Theological literature of the present day, and would prove a most invaluable manual for many years to come, yet the more carefully the book is studied will the student become convinced that no other mode would so fully meet the issues which are now dividing the churches. The author has waived a strictly scientific arrangement, in favor of one by which all classes of sincere students may find aid in their inquiries after truth.

The book opens with a sketch of the origin and cause of the Reformation. The various theories which have been proposed by both friends and foes, to account for its rise and success, are briefly stated and examined. Rejecting the hypotheses of the rancor of monkish malice, love of novelty, personal genius of the great leader of the movement, fermenting political discontents, influence of the great councils in diminishing the authority of the Pope, etc., as causes which, either singly or in combination, are sufficient for the effects, the author finds the source of the entire work in the Word of God. The development of the plans of Divine Providence, in the preservation of the Holy Scriptures, during the years of the Church's corruption, and in the enkindling of a new life, through their study, is so graphically portrayed as to call forth anew the admiring wonder and thanksgiving of every Christian reader. A happier introduction to the succeeding discussion could not

have been conceived. It places the reader at the very outstart, upon the stand-point from which he is to examine and decide for himself, the true position of the principles which are here set forth. This stand-point is the supreme authority of the word of God in all matters of faith and practice.

The second chapter presents a brief survey of the life of the Great Reformer. It is a collation of beautiful pictures based upon König's illustrations of the life of Luther. Whilst the reader of most mature mind cannot fail to be both deeply interested and greatly benefited, the style is so plain as to afford instruction and delight even to a child. It describes with unusual truth, simplicity and power, the life, in all its many sides, of one of the truest and noblest and greatest of men, and contains passages which, in true eloquence and tender pathos, have rarely been equalled. The last forty pages of this chapter comprise a most valuable collection of estimates of the character and works of Luther, made by some forty-eight authors of various ages, nationalities and religions. Erasmus and Melanchthon and Calvin, Chemnitz and Gerhard and Buddeus, Bishops Atterbury and Tennison and Kidder, Bossuet and Dupin and Stolberg and Schlegel, Bayle and Heine, Lessing and Wieland, Hamann and Herder, Hase and Kuhne and Bunsen and Kahnis, Coleridge and Carlyle and D'Israeli, friends of the Reformation and foes, all are made to bear their testimony concerning this wonderful man. The attack of the Jesuit Palavicini is refuted by Raumer, whilst the English assailants, Hallam, Hamilton, and a few of less note, are answered by Archdeacon Hare, of the Church of England. The accurate and discriminating analysis which follows this testimony, brings out the prominent traits of Luther's character with marked distinctness.

"He was not a mere mountain-top, catching a little earlier the beams which by their own course would soon have found the valleys; but rather by the divine ordination under which he rose, like the sun itself, without which the light on mountain and valley would have been but a starlight or moonlight. He was not a secondary orb, reflecting the light of another orb, as

was Melanchthon and even Calvin; still less the moon of a planet as Bucer or Brentius; but the centre of undulations which filled a system with glory. Yet though he rose wondrously to a divine ideal, he did not cease to be a man of men. He won the trophies of power and the garlands of affection. Potentates feared him, and little children played with him. He has monuments in marble and bronze, medals in silver and gold; but his noblest monument is the best love of the best hearts, and the brightest, purest impression of his image has been left in the souls of regenerated nations. * * * * Four potentates ruled the mind of Europe in the Reformation, the Emperor, Erasmus, the Pope, and Luther. The Pope wanes, Erasmus is little, the Emperor is nothing, but Luther abides as a power for all time. His image casts itself upon the current of ages, as the mountain mirrors itself in the river that winds at its foot—the mighty fixing itself immutably upon the changing."

If this be regarded an extravagant eulogy of the human instrumentality, through which the work of the Reformation was effected, let the reader remember that in all of God's dealings with men, the divine energy and the human instrumentality are so blended, that to despise the latter is to despise the work accomplished through it, and gratitude for the former will always manifest itself in respect and affection towards the agency, through which the power has wrought (Luke x. 16). Those who regard the Reformation as a work of God, can never cherish too fondly the memory of the man to whom, in the appointment of Providence, they are indebted for this great blessing, but they cannot go farther. "We do not ascribe to Luther," says Gerhard,* "the authority of a prophet or apostle, nor absolute infallibility, neither do we consider his writings equal to those of the prophets and apostles, nor do we believe him in any proposition without proof from the Word of God; but we regard him as an eminent teacher, whom in these last times God has raised up for the good of the Church which has been oppressed beneath the Papal yoke, and has endowed with extraordinary gifts and remarkable strength of

* Confessio Catholica, Lib. I., Part I., Cap. VI.

mind, to remove corruptions and abuses by the pure preaching of the gospel, and to bring back to light the truth almost buried in the darkness of error."

The third chapter on Luther's translation of the New Testament, is of high importance to the critical scholar, presenting the fruit of the most thorough research, especially in its discussion of the Greek text, from which the translation was made.

The fourth chapter, on the Conservative Church of the Reformation, is a type of the whole book. It contains within a small compass what might easily have been expanded into a volume. The prominent features of the Lutheran Church, as regards its name, its character and claims, its doctrines, its relations to other denominations, its internal and external history, Church constitution, Divine worship, and practical working, are set forth so clearly as to leave hereafter no excuse for the ignorance which has prevailed, even among those who profess her name. By a calm statement of facts, this chapter proves that the Evangelical Lutheran Church need only be known in order to be loved. The objections often urged against her name are fully met. "The curious fact" is established, "that as an ordinary rule, the more large, catholic and churchly the title of a sect, the smaller, narrower, and more sectarian is the body that bears it," and that the most truly catholic of bodies is sometimes compelled to submit to the necessity of being known by the name of a human originator. The name "Evangelical," which she herself has proposed, is shown to be the most appropriate, not only because, "in no system is Christ so much as in the Lutheran," but also on account of the very errors charged against her, being "those which would arise from an excess in this direction." In regard to "*Lutheran*," first given her by her enemies, the position is taken: "The Church simply tolerates the name to avoid the misapprehension and confusion which would arise, if it were laid aside." Yet, as in the necessity of distinctive names, this has been forced upon her, it is shown, by an able and thorough discussion, that "in the posture of all the facts, the name of Luther defines the character of a particular Church, as no other could."

"As distinct from the Romish Church, and all churches which obscure the grace of the Gospel, or do not confess its doctrines in all their fulness, let her consent to be called the EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, to testify, if God so please to the end of time, that she is neither ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, nor of Christ's servant, who in the presence of earth and hell, restored that Gospel, preached it, and died in the triumph of its faith." Her claims are presented as the oldest and most extensive of Protestant churches, as the most conservative, the greatest educator, the most rooted in the ancient faith, the most progressive and the most submissive to God's Word.

"More than forty millions of the human race acknowledge her as their spiritual mother; and she gives them all not only the one rule of faith, *but she does what no other Church does, acknowledging the Bible as her only authority, she gives to her various nationalities one confession of faith*, the Augsburg Confession."

As distinguishing her from other churches,

"The Romish Church makes divine things objects of *sense*, the ultra-Protestant principle would make them objects of *understanding*, the Lutheran Church holds them as objects of *faith*."

Her faith is summarily presented:

"We are justified by God, not through any merits of our own, but by His tender mercy, through faith in His Son. The depravity of man is total in its extent, and his will has no positive ability in the work of salvation, but has the negative ability (under the ordinary means of grace) of ceasing its resistance. Jesus Christ offered a proper, vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice. Faith in Christ presupposes a true penitence. The renewed man co works with the Spirit of God. Sanctification is progressive, and never reaches absolute perfection in this life. The Holy Spirit works through the Word and Sacraments, which only in the proper sense are means of grace. Both the Word and the Sacraments bring a positive grace, which is offered to all who receive them outwardly, and which is actually imparted to all who in faith embrace it."

The differences between Lutheranism and Arminianism, and the relation of the rule of faith to the Creed, are clearly defined. Accurate statements are given of those doctrines, in which the Church of the Reformation has been misrepresented. These, with the exception of the doctrine of the Lord's Day, are amply discussed in succeeding chapters. The omission has been wisely made, inasmuch as this doctrine is not one of distinctive Lutheranism, the Conservative and the Radical Reformation, in their earlier days, having been a unit on the subject.

As opposed to those in other communions who may be inclined to regard Lutheranism as adverse to the spirit of true Christianity, the testimony of some of their most eminent teachers is cited to the contrary. We find Zwingle, Calvin, Alting, Spanheim, Claude, Turretin, Pictetus and others, all bearing witness to the general purity of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church.

The charge of High-churchism so often made in their ignorance, by perhaps well-meaning but misguided men, is shown to be utterly groundless:

"Against the High-churchism which makes dividing walls of forms, ceremonies, modes of government, the Lutheran Church ever enters a living protest. * * * * With every external human thing alike, there is no unity if the parts of a communion are alien in faith. On the other hand, with every external human thing diverse, there *is* unity if there be harmony in faith. If there be a High-churchism genuinely Lutheran, it is a very different thing from that which bears that name in other churches. The Lutheran Church does claim that it is God's truth which she confesses, and by logical necessity regards the deviations from the doctrines of the Confession as deviations from divine truth, but she does not claim to be the whole Church."

Not only has the author abundantly shown that the Lutheran Church is of all others the firmest in her convictions, and the most decided in their expression. He presents her here as yielding to none in charity and liberality, in Catholicity and

mildness. The bigotry so often ascribed to her is shown to be entirely foreign to her spirit. The charge is traced to the malice of enemies, and the weakness of nominal friends. Those who have used her name to endorse their own exclusiveness, in judging all other churches as utterly unscriptural, are accoun- ed as men who know not the spirit they are of.

The controversies of the Lutheran Church are enumerated. Then follows a brief and most valuable survey of Theological Science as she has developed it. All her prominent theologians in Europe are mentioned, according to the era in which they flourished, and are classified in schools, according to the tendency of thought which they represent. To this list, the names of eighty-one writers in the United States are added. After a list of the Universities of Europe, which are Lutheran, either in whole, or in part, there follow a sketch of Lutheran missions, an explanation of her Church constitution and Divine Worship, and a portrayal of her practical working in the life, in Germany, Scandinavia, and America. Her mission in this country is especially dwelt upon, the dangers to which she is exposed, and the difficulties she must meet are stated, and the true course is shown in which, by God's help, success is certain.

The chapter on "the Confessional Principle of the Conservative Reformation" clearly explains the difference between the Confession of Faith and the Rule of Faith, and exhibits the harmony between them, when each occupies its proper sphere. The objections urged against confessions of faith are shown to be of the most frivolous character, and their necessity is proved by a most conclusive argument. If theological disputants could only lay aside their prejudices, and candidly examine the subject, they would be forced to acknowledge that their opposition to confessions of faith, arises not from any objection to the principle upon which the confessions are based, but from their antagonism to the doctrines, which these confessions contain. If the confessions embodied their own opinions, these zealots would be as loud in the praise, as they are now in the condemnation of creeds. We insert a striking illustration:

"The Bible can no more be any man's Creed, than the stars

can be any man's astronomy. The stars furnish the rule of the astronomer's faith: the Principia of Newton may be the confession of his faith. If a man were examined as a candidate for the chair of astronomy in a university, and were asked, 'What is your astronomical system?' and were to answer, 'I accept the teaching of the stars,' the reply would be, 'You may think you do—so does the man who is sure that the stars move round the world, and that they are not orbs, but 'gimlet holes to let the glory through.' We wish to know what you hold the teaching of the stars to be? Do you receive as in harmony with them, the results reached by Copernicus, by Galileo, by Kepler, by Newton, La Place, and Herschel, or do you think the world one great flat, and the sun and moon pendants to it?' 'Gentlemen,' replies the independent investigator, 'the theories of these astronomers are human systems—man-made theories. I go out every night on the hills, and look at the stars, as God made them, through a hole in my blanket, with my own good eyes, not with a man-made telescope, or fettered by a man-made theory; and I believe in the stars, and in what they teach me; but if I were to say or write what they teach, that would be a human creed—and I am opposed to all creeds.'"

The necessity of the distinctive creeds of the Lutheran Church, is also shown, and the meaning of subscription to a confession explained. The immorality of subscribing to confessions, whilst rejecting the doctrines they declare, is exposed. The abuse of the right of private judgment is to be restrained not by persecution, but by denial of Church recognitions. The Confessional Basis of the Lutheran Church is founded on God's Word, belongs to historical Lutheranism, is commended by other communions, and is essential to union in fundamentals. The word fundamental is shown to embody a truly Biblical and Lutheran idea. But as opposed to the idea that "the word *fundamental* should not be defined," the position is taken that "any formula of agreement on fundamentals which leaves it an open question what are fundamentals, is delusive and dishonest, and will ultimately breed dissension, and tend to the destruction of the Church." But the chapter is so full that we cannot attempt an outline of it. Every sentence will commend itself to

that class of thoughtful persons, who, in these days of Church agitation, are earnestly endeavoring to attain a clear conception of the issues at stake. The closing pages are of especial value, in which the course of error is traced, first to the asking for toleration, then to the claiming of equal rights, and then to the assertion of supremacy. All this is illustrated by a brief survey of the History of Rationalism, as it proceeded from Pseudo-Pietism and Fanaticism to Indifferentism, from Indifferentism to Unionism, from Unionism to Moderate Rationalism and thence to the spiritual desolation which followed.

The sixth chapter treats of the Augsburg Confession. The thoroughness of the investigation of which this discussion is the result, may be inferred from the extensive and valuable bibliographical lists in the foot-notes, containing the titles of some two hundred and thirty works bearing upon the subject, all of which, with a few exceptions, are in the library of the author. After a general introduction to the confessional literature of the Church, the position is established that the Evangelical Lutheran, as a particular Church, is more than thirty years older than the Romish, inasmuch as her distinctive Creed, the Augsburg Confession, preceded that of Romanism, the Decrees of the Council of Trent, by that length of time. The History of the Augsburg Confession in all its important details is fully narrated. The hypothesis of Rückert, according to which Luther was prevented by a strategy of the Elector, from actually participating in its composition, is accurately examined and completely overthrown by the evidence of original documents. Inasmuch as the aim of the theory is to prove the existence, in the Confessions, of concessions to Rome, which would have met the disapproval of Luther, if he had been aware of them, we have always thought it sufficiently answered from the ground of internal evidence; for all the doctrines thus attacked can be reproduced from innumerable passages of Luther, written not only after, but very many before the Diet of Augsburg. Scarcely a charge of this kind can be made against the Augsburg Confession, which does not apply also to the Larger and Smaller Catechisms. Yet it is a matter of congratulation,

that the author has met the hypothesis on its own ground, and found it to be so entirely opposed to the facts in the case. In connection with this chapter, we have carefully studied in the original the entire correspondence referred to, and can bear witness to the accuracy of every statement in the discussion.

The history of the *Variata* is fully discussed. The conclusion reached is: "The history of the Augsburg Confession demonstrates that not only is it no gain to the peace of the Church, but produces a yet more grievous disturbance of it, when the effort is made to harmonize men by an agreement in ambiguous phraseology, the adoption of terms which are to be accepted in one sense by one set of men, and in another sense by another."

A testimony, so consonant with that of a recent Calvinistic writer, concerning another effort of Melanchthon, that we are induced to place them side by side:

"We learn another lesson from what occurred at the Diet of Ratisbon. It shows the possibility of appearing to concede almost everything, while one point is reserved, or wrapped up in ambiguous language, which is found always sufficient to neutralize every concession, and to leave the parties as much at variance as before. It has been justly said that in controversies of faith, the difference between antagonistic systems is often reduced to a line sharp as a razor's edge, yet, on one side of that line there is God's truth, and on the other a departure from it." *

The history of the current editions is also presented. The Confession is accurately analyzed and its great value set forth. An interesting and important question discussed, is, "Can we honorably bear the name of Evangelical Lutherans and honestly profess to receive the Augsburg Confession as our Creed, while we reject or leave open to rejection, parts of the doctrine whose reception gave our Church her separate being and distinctive name?" The answer is based upon the facts, that the

* The Doctrine of Justification, an outline of its history in the Church, and of its exposition from Scripture, by James Buchanan, D.D., LL. D., Edinburgh, 1867, p. 136.

Confession presented the undivided faith of the Lutheran Church in the Empire, that all Kingdoms, States and cities which professed to be Lutheran adopted the Unaltered Confession, that the arguments now used to assail the faith had all been used before the Confession was presented, and that at the Diet of Augsburg two other Confessions were presented, differing chiefly from the Augsburg Confession on the Sacraments. The testimony of the Confession, when it speaks of itself, is shown to be decisive.

The Secondary Confessions of the Reformation, are discussed with the same thoroughness. The plea often made against the Book of Concord, that its size is sufficient to demand its rejection, is briefly, but convincingly answered. The objection, that the addition of other Symbolical Books to the Augsburg Confession, is a change of Creed, is examined at length and completely refuted. It is proven that the same argument would attack the gradual formation of the Old and New Testament Canons, and would be sufficient to cause the rejection of the Apostles' Creed, together with the other two general Creeds, and the Augsburg Confession itself. The succeeding Creeds are regarded simply as fuller definitions of the faith contained in former Creeds. The Book of Concord is shown to have repressed, instead of favored the multiplication of creeds. The different Confessions are then treated of separately. The discussion embraces the necessity of each Confession, with a detailed history of its preparation and subsequent reception, and an ample exposition of its value, as manifested both by its contents and the testimony of various authors. As the opposition to the Book of Concord centres around the Formula of Concord, the treatment of this Confession is the most extended. Never has the Church been in a more critical condition, than at the time of its preparation. Nor has any human instrument ever been composed with so much care, with so many revisions and re-revisions to free it from all ambiguity, and set forth the truth in all clearness and simplicity. It is the product of years of the most earnest and conscientious labor, by men who, as devoted Christians, and learned and accurate theologians have

never been surpassed. In its immediate results and far-reaching consequences, as a testimony for positive Christianity, its power for good cannot be estimated.

"But for the Formula of Concord it may be questioned whether Protestantism could have been saved to the world. It staunched the wounds at which Lutheranism was bleeding to death, and crises were at hand in history, in which Lutheranism was essential to the salvation of the whole reformatory interest in Europe. The thirty years' war, the war of martyrs which saved our modern world, lay indeed in the future of another century, yet it was fought and settled in the Cloister of Bergen. But for the pen of the peaceful triumvirate, the sword of Gustavus had not been drawn. Intestine treachery and division in the Church of the Reformation, would have done what the arts and arms of Rome failed to do. But the miracle of restoration was wrought. From being the most divided Church on earth, the Lutheran Church had become the most stable. The blossom put forth at Augsburg, despite the storm, the mildew and the worm, had ripened into the full, round fruit, of the amplest and clearest Confession in which the Christian Church has ever embodied her faith."

Outside of this volume, we have never met with as fine specimens of historical analysis, as this chapter contains. All the facts of history intimately connected with the origin, and the rejection or reception of the Formula of Concord, are resolved into their elements, and traced to their causes. But the analysis is not confined to historical facts. It embraces also the character of the theologians most prominent in the composition of the work, and the doctrinal result which they reached. The doctrinal analysis alone embraces fourteen pages, presenting the faith of the Formula succinctly and pointedly.

Those who have been in the habit of regarding the Formula of Concord, as causing the separation between the Lutheran, and the Zwinglian-Calvinistic Churches, or as substituting "the fossilization of the letter and the dogma, for the freedom of the Spirit and of the Word," should, in all candor, carefully weigh the counter statements with which this discussion closes.

Passing over from the historical to the doctrinal portion of the work, we meet first with the chapter on Original Sin. The treatment of the subject is based upon the Second Article of the Augsburg Confession. The development of the article from the articles of Marburg and Schwabach until it reaches the form in which we now have it, is carefully examined; the differences of reading in the various texts are fully given, and the criticisms made upon it, at the time of its presentation, are briefly stated. Then follows an astonishingly minute analysis of the article, which causes us to hesitate whether most to admire the richness of the Confession itself, or the skill of our author in the form in which he presents its doctrines. The discussion of the analysis, in its mode of treatment, in its illustrations, and in many of its arguments, is entirely original. In fullness, depth and force, it takes rank with any discussion of the same subject, within the range of Lutheran Theology. It considers Original Sin in all its relations, and gives a satisfactory answer to almost every question which the theme may suggest.

That the reader may obtain a glimpse of the rich stores which this chapter contains, we will follow the author, for a short distance in his discussion, notwithstanding the impossibility of condensing with accuracy, anything written by one so exceedingly concise and compact in all his statements as Dr. Krauth. The line of argument as clearly presented as we can, in outline, permitting the author to speak for himself as frequently as possible, is as follows: The Second Article of the Augsburg Confession affirms the unity of the Evangelical Church in the doctrine of Original Sin. The Augsburg Confession avoided all minor matters, and all statements of doctrine in regard to which there was any difference among those who presented it. A Lutheran historically and honestly such, cannot hold less than the Augsburg Confession ; hence it is as true now as it was when our Confession was given, that our Lutheran Churches hold, confess and teach the same doctrine of Original Sin.

The doctrine of the Second Article, rests upon the presuppo-

sitions of a sound general Anthropology. It presupposes a sound view of man as the proper subject of redemption. It presupposes a sound definition of man, as God's last and highest earthly creature, consisting of body and soul, having personality, freedom, moral accountability and immortality. It presupposes that the Biblical History of man's creation is literally true. Science establishes the fact that the whole human race is of one species; but cannot say whether the race has sprung from one pair or not. What science shows to be possible, revelation distinctly teaches. Science instead of weakening the Scripture witness to the unity of the race, shows that nature is economical in its resources, that only animals of the same species produce a permanently fertile offspring, that the traditions of the races point to a common origin, and that the languages of mankind show the original unity of races, which have been widely sundered. The hypotheses opposed to the Scriptural doctrine of the unity of the race, are those of the Co-adamites, Pre-adamites, and the Autochthons.

The Second Article presupposes also that subsequent to the first creation of man which was immediate, all human beings are the mediate creatures of God, and that consequently neither the body nor soul of children, results from an immediate creation of God. The propagation of the soul has been explained by three theories. The theory of Pre-existence was maintained by Plato. From Plato it went through Philo to Origen. In modern times it has been defended by Kant, Schelling, and Julius Muller. It has been beautifully stated by the English poet Wordsworth in his "Intimations of Immortality." Its latest defender is Dr. Edward Beecher. It does not bear the test of history, nor the witness of Scripture. It involves simply an undeveloped metempsychosis. The theory of Immediate Creationism maintains that there is a direct creation of the soul by God, and that about the fortieth day after conception, it is united with the embryo. Various passages of Scripture are appealed to in favor of this view, which is generally accepted in the Roman and Calvinistic Churches. But the theory is untenable. The strongest Scripture passages quoted to sustain

it, imply no more than that the spirit of man has higher attributes than his body. To Pelagians and Pelagianizing Romanists, this theory is not encumbered with the great moral difficulty arising from the acknowledgment of Original Sin, but to all others, the view involves unconscious Gnosticism. The third view is that of Traducianism or mediate Creationism; the theory that both body and soul are derived from the parents. This theory corresponds with the prevailing and clear statements of Scripture. It is a doctrine demanded by the existence of Original Sin, and the doctrine that God is not the author of sin. The Lutheran divines with very few exceptions are Traducian.

This article presupposes, antecedent to all human sin, a state of integrity. God had said, "Let us make man in our image," etc. This image of God in man, is something which is not absolutely lost in man, but is fearfully marred. The traditions of the race preserve the memory of a golden age; the confession implies the race has fallen. Man was created with an ability not to sin, which, had he been faithful, would have been merged into a condition, in which he could not sin; the "*posse non peccare*" would have become a "*non posse peccare*," and the "*posse non mori*," would have been merged into a "*non posse mori.*" Over against just and Scriptural views of the image of God, are arrayed first the views which suppose it to have been one of corporeal likeness. This was the view of the Anthropomorphites. Next the Socinians and many Arminians, conceding that it was in conjunction with immortality, yet restricted it to the dominion over the animal world. The Pelagians and Rationalists suppose the image of God, in its religious aspects, to have been little, if at all, injured. The Romish theology has a Pelagianizing tendency. The Fathers of the Greek Church, distinguish between the image of God, and His likeness. The Reformation found a deep corruption in this as in other doctrines. The testimony of the Apology and Formula of Concord against this spurious theology of the Church of Rome, is clear and distinct.

To a correct conception of original sin, it presupposes correct

views of sin in general. Sin is the transgression of the law, or rather it is that which is not consonant with law, it is the anti-legal, the un-legal and the non-legal. It pertains to the very essence of religion, that sin which is the opposite of religion, takes its origin not from the Creator, but from the creature; and however systems have tended logically to make God the author of sin, no system has unreservedly admitted such a conclusion. The standing sophism against just views of original sin, is that nothing is sin, except it be voluntary; and that nothing is voluntary, unless it be done with a distinct consciousness and purpose of the will. The New England Theology has laid special stress upon the false conception of what is voluntary. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession says: "The adversaries contend that nothing is sin, except it be voluntary. These expressions may hold good among philosophers, in judging of civil morals, but they have nothing to do with the judgment of God."

It presupposes that from the state of integrity, there was a fall of man into a state of sin. Rationalism and Pseudo-philosophism have treated the fall as a fable; an allegorical delineation of the passing away of the golden age, a myth of the transition from instinct to moral freedom, or of the pernicious result of longing after a higher condition. The literal historical sense of the narrative, is, nevertheless, the only one consistent with the obvious intent of the Holy Scriptures. There is nothing in the narrative unworthy of God, or out of keeping with the laws of the human soul. God gave the commandment, allowed the temptation, that, by it, man's natural holiness might be strengthened, if he *would*, by his free will. In the fall of our first parents, began original sin. A distinction is drawn between "peccatum originale originans," and "peccatum originale originatum." The latter is by pre-eminence styled "original sin." Thus original sin, if not by imputation, yet by some form of association, passed over to all the posterity of Adam and Eve. Whatever may be the relation of imputation to original sin, our Church holds it to be an impious opinion, that our misery and liability are merely the results of imputa-

tion. The primary point is, that we do actually participate, in our nature, in the corruption wrought by the fall.

We will carry the outline no farther. The time of the operation of original sin, the persons affected by it, the mode of its perpetuation, the great fact asserted in the doctrine, and its results, are discussed with the same exhaustiveness. The discussion of its essence is especially valuable. The terms applied by the Confession to original sin, are analyzed with great minuteness and accuracy. Thus, no less than seventeen analogies are found between it and *Morbus* disease. That original sin is truly sin, the author shows by an ample development of each of the following points: 1. It has the *relations* and *connections* of sin. 2. It has the *name* and *synonyms* of sin. 3. It has the *essence* of sin. 4. It has the *attributes* of sin. 5. It does the *acts* of sin. 6. It incurs the *penalties* of sin. 7. It needs the *remedies* of sin. 8. It is conformed to a true *definition* of sin. Of no less importance is the discussion of the Ninth Thesis: "The natural consequence of this original sin is this, that it condemns and brings now also eternal death." The difficulties in which this important doctrine is involved are fairly met, and the principal objections urged against it, are convincingly answered. The necessity of the new birth is set forth with a clearness and power impossible from any other stand-point. The eleventh thesis of this chapter considers the Holy Spirit as the sole author of the new birth. It is shown that this doctrine, whilst theoretically confessed by all Evangelical Christianity, is in practice constantly ignored. Its relation to infant regeneration is especially examined. That the latter is possible, is proven by the facts, that if the Holy Spirit can alone produce the new birth, the work of Christ cannot produce it separate from the applying power of the Holy Spirit, and that there is no regenerating power in relation to Christian parents, in birth in the midst of covenant privileges, or in death. "But if the Holy Spirit can work this change in an infant after death, He can just as readily do it before its death, and the whole idea of a purgation after death, of a change of relation to God after the departure of the soul, of a renewal of probation in an eter-

nal world, is utterly foreign to the entire tendency of the New Testament doctrine. To admit it is to admit the existence of a purgatory."

The discussion of the Twelfth Thesis is occupied with Baptism as one of the ordinary means of the new birth. Considerable attention is paid to the subject, in what sense is Baptism necessary? It is shown that the Lutheran Church does not teach that there are no exceptions to the necessity of Baptism; that she has never taught that all unbaptized persons are lost. The place which infant salvation holds in the Lutheran system, is clearly set forth by a contrast with its position in other systems.

"The PELAGIAN system would save them on the ground of personal innocence, but that ground we have seen to be fallacious. The CALVINISTIC system places their salvation on the ground of Divine election, and speaks of elect infants, and hence, in its older and more severe logical shape at least, supposed not only that some unbaptized, but also that some baptized infants were lost. * * * * The BAPTIST system, which totally withholds Baptism from the infant, and every system, which, while it confers the outward rite, denies that there is a grace of the Holy Spirit, of which Baptism is the ordinary channel, are alike destitute on their theory of any *means* actually appointed of God to heal the soul of the infant. The ROMISH system, too Pelagian to think that original sin could bring the positive pains of eternal death, and too tenacious of the external rite to concede that an infant could be saved without that rite, leaves its theologians, outside of this general determination, in a chaos of doubt. Some of them reach the middle theory that the unbaptized infant is neither in heaven nor hell, but in a dreary limbo. Others consign it to hell. * * * * How beautiful and self-harmonious over against all these, is the view of our Church. Over against the Calvinists it knows of no non-elect infants, but believes that our children are alike in the eyes of Infinite Mercy. Over against the Pelagians it confesses that all children are sinners by nature, and believes that the Holy Spirit must change these natures. Over

against the Anabaptists, and the school which is at heart in sympathy with the Anabaptist theory, though it retains infant Baptism as a form, our Church believes that God has appointed infant Baptism as the ordinary channel through which the Holy Spirit works a change in the nature of the child. In the fact that there is an ordinary means appointed, our Church sees the guaranty that God wishes to renew and save children, and *what so powerfully as this* prompts the blessed *assurance*, *that if God fails* to reach the child in His ordinary way, He will reach it in some other? * * * Because in the green valley, and along the still waters of the visible Church, God has made rich provision for these sin-stricken lambs,—because He has a fold into which He gathers them out of the bleak world, therefore do we the more firmly believe that if one of them faint ere the earthly hands which act for Christ can bring it to the fold and pasture, the great Shepherd, in His own blessed person, will bear to it the food and water necessary to nurture its undying life, and will take it into the fold on high, for which the earthly fold is meant, at best, but as a safeguard for a little while."

The doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, that the water and word of Baptism constitute one of the ordinary means of grace is proven to be firmly grounded upon the word of God.

The chapter closes with an explanation of the antithesis of the article, in which the errors condemned are carefully examined. The relationship of Zwinglianism and other schools to Pelagianism is forcibly presented.

No doctrine held by the Lutheran Church is so often misunderstood and misrepresented as that of the Person of Christ, and His sacramental presence. The aim of the tenth chapter is to correct these erroneous impressions by a calm and fair statement of her teaching. It shows most conclusively that the Lutheran Church has never believed in a *local* or *carnal* presence, in the Holy Supper, of the body and blood of Christ, and explains the mode in which the sacramental communion is oral. The language of the Formula of Concord, so often quoted to the contrary, is fully and satisfactorily explained. Whilst affirming the sacramental presence to be true and real, it de-

fines the mode as spiritual. Chemnitz, as one of the principal representatives of Lutheran Theology, is quoted at considerable length, to define the manner of Christ's presence since His ascension. The charge of Eutychianism, made against the doctrine, is refuted. The *Communicatio Idiomatum* is explained, the mere statement of which is a sufficient disproof. Even the finite presence of our Lord's humanity is shown to be definitive instead of local. The right hand of God is shown to be not a locality; the ascension not to be the rising to a place. The right hand of God is everywhere. Christ's sitting at the right hand of God denotes His rule "in co-sovereignty with the Father," a potency implying the presence of the whole person, and therefore also of His humanity. The contrary doctrine is proved to be Socinianizing in its tendency. Whilst the blessings of the communion are affirmed to be received by believers alone, yet the object sacramentally imparted is shown to be the same to all. The unbeliever "not discerning the Lord's body, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself."

"When a Paine or Voltaire takes a Bible into his hand to turn its life-giving nourishment to poison in his own soul, the Bible is no less the Bible, no less really the organ of the Holy Ghost, than when an Arndt or an Edwards bends over it in the deepest devotion. * * * It might as well be said, that because the Romanist does not discern the bread in the Supper he receives no bread, as that the unbeliever, because he does not discern the body of the Lord, does not commune with it sacramentally."

The communion affirmed by the Reformed view is shown to take place as fully without the Holy Supper as in it. The term "*ubiquitarian*" sometimes applied to the Lutheran doctrine is rejected, and its true designation stated as "The *personal* omnipresence of the human nature of Christ." After presenting against the Reformed theory the objections, that it rises into an unconscious rationalism, that it confounds the distinctive work of the two persons of the Trinity, and that after all it does not solve the mystery at which it is offended in the Lutheran doctrine, the latter is proved to be both scriptural and

in accordance with the testimony of the Church of all ages. Following this is a paragraph of special significance.

"In the great practical question of the undivided adoration of the humanity and Deity of Christ, there is no consistent position between the Lutheran doctrine and the Socinian. The Calvinistic divines, while they show in various ways that there is great difficulty in harmonizing their view of the person of Christ with the worship of Him in His human nature, are yet for the most part happily inconsistent. No man can really pray to the undivided Christ without in heart resting on the Lutheran doctrine of His person. Either the human nature of Christ is in inseparable unity of person with the Divine nature, or it is idolatry to worship Christ according to the human nature. This the Socinian Controversialists in New England saw at once, and their arguments which assumed the Nestorianizing views of New England as Orthodox, and which the Orthodox there defended as Scriptural, were consequently never fairly met. One source of the rapid and deadly triumphs of Socinianism in New England, was the unscriptural and lax views, which the system claiming to be orthodox, held of the person of Christ."

The eleventh chapter treats of Baptism. The first twenty-five pages are occupied with its mode, proving that the Lutheran Church does not hold that immersion is essential to Baptism. By some this discussion may be deemed unnecessary. It was, however, occasioned by statements from some professing to be Lutherans, who taught not only that Luther was an immersionist, but also that such was the doctrine of the Symbolical books. The same impression has also been sometimes created by writers of the Baptist Church. The discussion here presented, forever settles the question. It manifests the most thorough research, the most intimate acquaintance with the writings of Luther, and the most accurate knowledge and appreciation of the exact shades of meaning of the words and phrases of the German language. In the light of the evidence afforded by this chapter, to persist in accounting Luther an immersionist is to wilfully pervert the truth.

The internal efficacy of Baptism is next considered. The dis-

cussion centres around John iii. 5, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The question to be decided is whether it refers to Baptism. The author proves that it does, both from the context and the text itself. The parallel passages, Tit. iii. 5; Eph. v. 26; Heb. x. 21; 1 John v. 6-8; 1 Pet. iii. 21, 22; Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38; viii. 12; xxii. 16; Rom. vi. 3, are cited, and most of them accurately examined, confirming this interpretation. The fallacies in the resorts of interpreters to give to the passage another meaning, by means of Hendiadys and Epexegesis, are exposed. It is shown that there is not a solitary instance in which either our Lord, or the Evangelist John, or any New Testament writer, used the figure called Hendiadys, and that even were it used it would not affect the question involved. Epexegesis is also shown to be impossible. The figurative interpretations proposed being thus refuted, the literal meaning alone remains.

The necessity of Baptism which had been treated of in the chapter on Original Sin, is again presented here. The subject is of such importance, and the doctrine of the Lutheran Church on this point is so often misunderstood, that the repetition seems as necessary in this work as it does in the two articles of the Augsburg Confession, upon which the ninth and eleventh chapters are commentaries. All efficacy of Baptism *ex opere operato* is denied. The charge of teaching "Baptismal Regeneration" often made upon the Lutheran Church, as understood by those who make the charge, is shown to be entirely unfounded. From this the author derives a solution of the controversies which have of late been agitating the Church.

"It is our sincere belief that if the energy which has been expended in assailing as doctrines taught by our Confessions what they do not teach, had been devoted to ascertaining what is their real meaning, these years of sad controversy would have been years of building up, and of closer union, not years of conflict, years in which our ministry and members have had their minds poisoned against the truth of God as held by our Church." Yet there is a Scriptural Baptismal Regeneration which the

Lutheran Church does not deny, but rejoices in believing and confessing. The defects of the opposite theory are noticed, which, "while it secures the *forgiveness* of an infant's sins, makes no provision whatever for the *change* of its sinful nature."

"Where in the Word of God is there the shadow of that baleful doctrine, that *the sins of an unregenerate person are forgiven;* where the shadow of that deadly error, that God has provided a Church into which, *by His own ordinance, and at His command*, millions are brought, without *any change* in a nature whose moral evil is such as would condemn them forever from heaven? But if a refuge is sought in saying that infants are regenerated, but that Baptism in all its parts, element, word, and spirit, is not the ordinary channel of this grace, this is to accept a theory which has every difficulty which carnal reason urges against the doctrine of the Church, but which has nothing that even looks like a warrant for it in God's Word."

The Calvinistic and Lutheran views of Baptism are contrasted. The arguments of the Anabaptists against Infant Baptism are examined and refuted. An important position established in this refutation is, that infants have receptive faith. The doctrine is set forth with clearness and distinctness. The chapter closes with an extended and comprehensive definition of its subject, composed of various statements concerning it, found in the several confessions of the Lutheran Church.

The last three chapters, comprising nearly two hundred and fifty pages, are occupied with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; the twelfth chapter stating it thetically, the thirteenth considering it in its antithesis, and the fourteenth replying to various objections. If it be thought strange that so much space has been given to this one doctrine the answer is:

"It links itself with the whole system of Revelation, with the most vital parts of the Old and New Testament, so that it cannot be torn from its true connections without logically bringing with it the whole system. There is no process by which the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, in regard to the Lord's Supper, can be overthrown, which does not overthrow the entire fabric of the atonement."

After introducing the subject by a thorough examination of the Old Testament Foreshadows, the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession is analyzed, and made the basis of the discussion, in the same manner as the second and ninth articles are treated in previous chapters. Not only is the witness of the Old Testament types brought forward to prove the true presence of the sacramental objects, viz., the true body and blood of Christ, but it is conclusively shown that the words of the institution force us to this conclusion. The Eucharist is considered as a Supper, and as a testamentary and covenanting rite, whilst all these relations disprove a symbolical interpretation, the argument from the testamentary character of the words is of especial weight:

"If a will were produced in which the Testator had said, It is my wish and will that M. N. should have such and such a tract of land and so many thousand dollars; and when M. N. came to claim land and money, he was told that this 'tract of land' was a sign or symbol of the Heavenly Canaan, which is the home of the soul, as an earthly tract of land may be the residence of the body; and that the thousands of dollars were simply a sign of incorruptible treasures in the other world; and that the testator meant only that it was his wish and will that M. N. should have these good things of the other world, would he consider this sound interpretation?"

The various interpretations which have been resorted to, to evade the literal meaning of the words, are examined as they affect each of the words of institution, taken in order. In their efforts to refute the Lutheran doctrine, its opponents have at various times resorted to a figurative interpretation of each of the words except "eat." As, however, they have, for the most part, hazarded their theory upon the copula "*is*," special attention is paid to it in this discussion. That it cannot mean "signify, or be a symbol of," is shown by the facts that no translations, with any pretensions to character, and no impartial dictionary of the Greek so render the word, that no good dictionary of English assigns "to be" such meaning, and that those who maintain this theory have failed to produce

a single example of its use in that sense. Various passages which they have cited, such as, "I am the vine," "I am the door," are tested, and found not to be in point. Zwingle's revelation, although given in full by Gerhard in his *Loci*, we find narrated here for the first time in English.

Under the third Thesis of the article, the doctrine of Transubstantiation is examined, and shown to be unscriptural. The assertion that the Lutheran does not essentially differ from the Romish doctrine is disproved, and ample testimony is produced to convict those who have made the charge, of gross misrepresentation. Romanism and Rationalism are compared, and the principle of interpretation upon which each starts is found to be the same.

The fact of the Sacramental Communion is presented from 1 Cor. x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?. The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" The passage is considered in all its relations, and the opposition between it and the Romish, Rationalistic and Calvinistic theories, made manifest. The interpretation adopted is sustained by a long array of authorities of almost every age and every portion of the Christian Church.

In the same manner, 1 Cor. xi. 27–29 is cited in support of the proposition that the true body and blood of Christ, as communicated under the species of bread and wine, are *received by all communicants*. The correct application of the text, is proven by a careful exegesis, whilst objections to the doctrine it contains are met by extended, varied and convincing arguments from analogy. The summary at the close of the chapter presents the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacramental presence, with such explicitness that it cannot be misunderstood by those who are willing to give the statement careful and unprejudiced attention. An important principle is developed in the argument, by which it is shown that a prominent feature of the Lutheran doctrine, as contrasted with the opposite tendency, is the importance it attaches to Christ as a living instead of a dead Saviour.

"If Christ must die to make our redemption, He must live to apply it. If the Lord's Supper is a Sacrament of the redemption made by His death, it is also a Sacrament of the same redemption applied by His life. If it tells us that His body and blood were necessary to make our redemption, it tells us also that they are still necessary to apply the redemption they then made."

The repugnance to the Scriptural doctrine of the Eucharist sometimes felt, is ascribed to an actual, though perhaps unconscious, repugnance to the doctrine of the atonement by Christ's body and blood.

"If Christ, through His body, made remission of sins, why do we ask, to what end is the doctrine, that the same body through which He made remission is that through which He applies it? His body, *as such*, could make no remission of sins, but through the Eternal Spirit, with which it was conjoined in personal unity, it made redemption—His body, *as such*, may have no power to apply the redemption, or to be with the redeemed, but through the same relation by which it entered into the sphere of the supernatural to make redemption, it reveals itself now in that same sphere to apply it. All theology, without exception, has had views of the atonement which were lower or higher, as its views of the Lord's Supper were low or high. Men have talked and written as if the doctrine of our Church, on this point, were a stupid blunder, forced upon it by the self-will and obstinacy of one man. The truth is that this doctrine, clearly revealed in the New Testament, clearly confessed by the early Church, lies at the very heart of the Evangelical system—Christ is the centre of the system, and in the Supper is the centre of Christ's revelation of Himself. The glory and mystery of the incarnation combine there, as they do nowhere else. Communion with Christ is that by which we live, and the Supper is '*the* Communion.'"

The chapter which treats of "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper considered in its antithesis," comprising about ninety pages, is one of the most able and profound in the book. We will not enter into details, but say simply that, with a thorough-

ness which is completely overpowering, it exposes the fallacy of all theories which, in the words of institution, ascribe the *touto*, this, to bread, or interpret *esti* metaphorically.

The last chapter answers objections which have been urged against the Scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The charges of consubstantiation, impanation and that of any local or physical presence of Christ's body and blood, are refuted by the testimony of even such opponents as Zwingle, Œcolampadius and Calvin, which is abundantly confirmed by quotations from Luther, the Thesis maintained by the Lutheran divines at the Heidelberg discussion, Brentius, the Formula of Concord, Chemnitz, Andreæ, Hutter, Andrew Osiander, Menter, Gerhard, Carprov, Muræus, Scherner, Calovius, Quenstedt, Bauer, Leibnitz, Buddeus, and Cotta; from the Roman Catholic divines, Perrone, Becan, Bellarmin, Moehler and Wiseman, and the Calvinists, Bucer, Musculus, Whitaker, Salmasius and Stapfer.

The contradiction sometimes asserted of the Lutheran doctrine, in receiving the term cup in a figurative sense, whilst insisting upon a literal interpretation of the other words of institution, is satisfactorily explained, by showing the difference between grammatical metonymy and a metaphor.

The objection derived from the visible presence of Christ, is thus stated and answered:

"Men are asked: 'Can you believe that the body which continued to sit visibly and palpably before them, was communicated in any real manner by the bread?' It is evident at first sight that the objection assumes a falsity, to wit, that the body of Christ, though personally united with Deity, has no mode of true presence but the visible and palpable. * * * * If, to make the argument hold, the objector insists, 'That, if the body were not communicated in that visible and palpable mode, it could be communicated in no true mode,' he abandons one objection to fly to another; and what he now has to do is to prove that the palpable and visible mode of presence is the only one possible to the body of our Lord which is in personal union with Deity. * * * * The Lutheran doctrine of the

Eucharist in no degree contradicts the testimony of the senses. * * * But body and blood supernaturally present, are not the objects of the senses. * * * * He who can believe against the apparent evidence of all these, that the bleeding and dying Nazarene was the everlasting God, ought not to hesitate, when he affirms it, to believe that what is set before us in the Holy Supper is more than meets the eye, or offers itself to the grasp of reason. The interpretation which finds mere bread in the Institution finds logically mere man in the Institutor."

To remove the impression that the results of modern philosophical thinking are in conflict with the faith of the Church, a most valuable sketch of Modern Philosophy is given, according to the various schools into which it is divided. The doctrines of each school, concerning the relation of the mind and its cognitions, to the reality of the external world, are concisely stated. The result reached is that philosophy is utterly powerless to fix or unfix our faith in the testimony of God.

The objection sometimes made, that it is impossible for *a human* body to be thus present, is shown to contain a fallacy, the true question being, "Can a body which is in inseparable union with the Godhead, be thus present?" With the clear evidence of Revelation, that God wills that this body should be present, to deny its presence upon the ground that it is impossible, is to incur the guilt of Rationalism. Other doctrines are shown to be in every way as incomprehensible. Such are the doctrines of Self-existence, Creation, Omnipresence, Eternity, the Trinity, and the Hypostatic union.

Although the burden of proof is cast upon the opponents of the Lutheran doctrine, in accordance with the principle that those who have the literal sense of the text on their side are under no obligation to argue for their doctrine until the literal sense be proved untenable, the weakness of the Rationalizing position is exposed. The argument from the nature of things is disproven by the fact that the nature of things is the result of God's will, and as such is limited and modified as He pleases. The plea of self-contradiction is answered by citations from some of the greatest of modern thinkers, who,

however much their tendency in some respects may be contrary to their doctrine, and however antagonistic their systems may be, yet agree in declaring the inconceivable, no true ground from which to infer the impossible. Our incapacity to judge in reference to the metaphysics of a personal union, is shown from our ignorance of the nature of the union between soul and body in man; and as we know so little in regard to what it is possible for God to do with our own bodies, much less able are we to decide concerning the possibilities in a union of a human body and soul with a divine nature. That the same line of argument which supports the Lutheran doctrine cannot be used in favor of Transubstantiation, is shown in a masterly manner, by proving that the testimony of the senses is conclusive against transubstantiation, but presents nothing whatever against the doctrine of a true presence. An illustration in this connection is one of the most striking in the book. We only regret that our limits forbid its insertion.

Against the objections of our Lord's declarations of His absence, the following propositions are presented:

"*First*, If the expressions which speak of the absence of Jesus from the world, are to be pressed without the Scriptural limitations as to the nature of His absence, it would follow that His divine nature is also absent."

"*Secondly*, Our Lord when He speaks of His absence makes it antithetical, not to His essential presence, but simply to one kind of that presence, to wit, the continually visible or purely natural."

"*Thirdly*, Just as explicitly as Christ, the whole Christ, is said to be absent, is He affirmed to be present."

"*Fourthly*, If it be urged that Christ '*ascended into heaven*,' therefore He is not on earth, we reply, He not only has ascended into heaven, but according to the Apostle, He has passed *through* the heavens (Heb. iv. 14), 'is made higher than the heavens' (Heb. vii. 26), and has 'ascended up *far above all heavens*' (Eph. iv. 10); but with the Apostle, we add, not that He may desert all things, or be absent from them, but 'that He might fill all things.'"

Each of these propositions is sustained by an ample discussion. The objection from Christ's sitting on the right hand of God is answered, as in the chapter on the Person of Christ. The expression, "in, with and under," of the Formula of Concord, is defended. The continual presence of the humanity of Christ in the Church is proved to be no argument against the Sacramental presence.

"God is everywhere present, yet the Pagan cannot find Him for want of the divine means to actualize that presence. The Holy Ghost is everywhere present, but He can be found only in His Word, and the ordinances, and cannot be found in nature, or any book of man. T he divine nature ofthe Son i personally present with every human creature, nay, is in every believer, yet no man thereby becomes incarnate God. All substantial presence in the divine economy becomes operative through means."

An objection of Kahnis concerning the time at which the Sacramental presence begins, is answered by showing that the Lutheran doctrinal teaches that the Sacramental presence "begins with the beginning of the Supper, and ends with its close." The objection urged by Roman Catholics, and some High Church Episcopalians, that the Lutheran doctrine of justification by Faith makes null the benefits of the Lord's Supper, is met by a valuable quotation from the admirable discussion of Chemnitz in his "*Examen.*" In short, there seems to be no objection whatever, against the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which the author has not answered; no real difficulty connected with it, of which he has not given a satisfactory solution. He has examined the subject to its inmost depths, and produced, as the results of his investigations, an exhaustive treatment of it, over which all who know how to prize the truth, will rejoice for many, many years to come.

The book closes with these words:—

"We have dwelt at what may seem disproportioned length upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but we have done so not in the interest of division, but of peace. At this point the division opened, and at this point, the restoration of peace must

begin. Well-set bones knit precisely where they broke; and well knit, the joint of breaking becomes the strongest in the bone. The Reformation opened with a prevailing conservative character. There lay before it not merely a glorious possibility, but an almost rapturous certainty, waiting upon the energy of Reform guided by the spirit of Conservatism. The Reformation received its first appalling check in the invasion of its unity of faith, by the crudities of Carlstadt, soon to be followed by the colder, and therefore yet more mischievous sophistries of Zwingle. The effort of reformation, in some shape, was beyond recall. Henceforth the question was between conservative reformation, and revolutionary radicalism. Rome and the world-wide errors which stand or fall with her, owe their continued baleful life, not so much to the arts of her intrigue, the terror of her arms, the wily skill and intense devotion of Jesuitism and the orders, as they owe it to the division and diversion created by the radicalism which enabled them to make a plausible appeal to the fears of the weak and the caution of the wise. But for this, it looks as if the great ideal of the conservative reformation, might have been consummated; the whole Church of the West might have been purified. * * * * The Oriental Church could not have resisted the pressure. The Church Catholic, transfigured by her faith, * * * would have risen in a grandeur before which the world would have stood in wonder and awe. But such yearnings as these wait long on time. Their consummation was not then to be, but it shall be yet."

We have endeavored, in this imperfect sketch, to enable the reader to form for himself a judgment concerning the scope and character of the work. A correct idea of its richness, fullness and depth, can be gained only when it is examined for itself. It is a large volume, containing, in a condensed form, a vast amount of valuable truth, and affording material for years of study. Of all theological works prepared by American divines, this is undoubtedly the most learned and profound. Its discussions compare favorably with those of any work which the Lutheran Church has produced at any period of her history.

To the student of the present day, it will prove in many respects of more value than even the masterpieces of the seventeenth century. On some subjects the author has gone into details which, at first, may be deemed superfluous, and presents a mass of evidence much greater than may seem necessary; but this both proves the strength of his position, and affords the defenders of the Church's faith an armory, in which they may find at all times weapons effectual against opponents of every class. We predict for the work an influence second to no other that has appeared in this country, in conveying correct views of God's truth, removing misunderstandings, and hastening in Christianity that true union, in the interests of which it has been written. It is a book which will be studied and referred to, and admired and loved, for generations to come.

This masterly treatise creates the desire for more. The Church would hail with joy the appearance of a work from the same author, treating of those doctrines, in which the Protestant denominations agree, as this treats of those in which they differ.

ART. V.—THEORY OF REVIVALS.*

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE, CAVETOWN, MD.

IN the estimation of many persons, it is considered an act of impiety to call in question, even in a general way, the subject of Revivals, but especially is the sin increased, when the theory underlying them, or the manner in which they are conducted, is questioned, and its expediency doubted. Who would dare say aught against anything which has for its object the

* Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England, 1740, to which is prefixed a Narrative of the Surprising Work of God, in Northampton, Mass., 1735. By *Jonathan Edwards*, A.M., Pastor of the Church of Christ in Northampton, afterwards President of Nassau Hall College, Princeton, N. J. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau St., N. Y.

The *Anxious Bench*, by *John W. Nevin*, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary of the German Reformed Church. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, Tekel, Dan. v. 27. *Chambersburg*, Pa., 1844.

conversion of souls and the glory of God. The very attempt would show, in the estimation of the proud, self-righteous Pharisee, an unconverted heart, and would be sufficient to put the offender under the ban, and then loudly call upon the zealous, converted portion, to offer public prayers for the interposition of God's grace, to convert the soul of the stubborn and hard-hearted opposer to Evangelical Christianity and true, genuine, experimental religion. In the face of this, we shall fearlessly say what belongs to the subject, as viewed from another "stand-point," believing that to be in conformity with the faith of the German Reformed Church on that subject, as well as in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, as developed in the early Church.

The first of these works gives a glowing account of a wonderful work of grace in Massachusetts, long before Boston was "the hub of the universe," and falls in with the theory of revivals as entertained in our day, which is known by the system of "the Anxious Bench," as practiced at Camp-meetings, and at revivals, generally occurring during the long winter evenings. The second work, or tract, takes opposite ground, and stands in the bosom of an order that is different, and advocates the old, educational system, exposing also the defects and absurdities of the former system, and at the time it appeared, drew down upon the venerable author a perfect storm of abuse, a storm which revealed a spirit anything but Christian, shameful in its attacks, at times ungentlemanly and absolutely mean. In spite of this spirit the Tract lived, and long ere this, the fierce replies, "like the crackling of thorns under a pot," have made their way into smoke and ashes; it has been seen and admitted that the New Measure System *was* an innovation, and that the Tract by Dr. Nevin was right. These two works, then, are to be regarded as entirely different from each other, and advocating different theories of religion.

Christianity, like its Founder, is ever the same, and it can never change into any other system or scheme. It has a life of its own with which it starts, and this life it is ever developing. Like the force or life in the seed, which is unfolded

under certain conditions, presenting different stages of its life, and so on to its full fruiting, yet is it ever the same life or force; so also in Christianity is there room for expansion, and we find the same phenomenon taking place, evolving a life peculiar to itself, and this unfolding we have in the race and also in the individual life, continuing ever the same, on to its full completion. This development, of course, takes place in the bosom of the Christian Church, and only there, for beyond her the conception of Christianity is not possible; beyond her there can be no Christian character unfolded. This gives us an idea of History, and the unfolding of this life in the course of the ages, gives us the idea of the History of the Church. Now, this leaves no room for the conception even of a new system, neither is it supposable, that new forces are to be engrafted on it, as little as it is possible to graft new life into the plant. In this view Jesus Christ never changes, does not receive new life, nor admit new forces, but is ever "the same, yesterday, to-day and forever," and is with His Church, which is His Body, always, even to the end of the world. The Christian Church is the form in which the unfolding of God's will takes place, and into which the individual must be brought so as to obtain eternal salvation. In this wonderful order, the Body of Christ, there is a life in every way peculiar, belonging only here and nowhere else, and to this the individual will must become submissive, in order to obtain eternal life, and it is utterly incomprehensible, how ministers can teach people that eternal life can be secured on the outside of this life, or beyond the pale of the Church. How beautiful all this is affirmed in the Creeds, but especially in the Apostles' Creed, in the stream of which life individual subjects must stand. "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. . . . This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe truly and firmly, he cannot be saved." We are aware, that on this point precisely, different theories are held, even as there are held different theories of redemption,

these diverging vastly from each other. Very much depends upon the conception we have of the Church herself, as well as her object; then, too, the idea of the Christian ministry, with the functions belonging to this sacred office. All this has great bearing on the subject under consideration.

In order that our position may be understood, it will be necessary to keep in mind the nature of the Church, as an Institute from heaven to men for the great purpose of saving souls—an idea which is repeatedly held forth in the pages of this REVIEW. In her we have the Body of Christ, in communion with which, life is to be had. We are well aware that there has been a fearful falling away from this original, ancient faith, and much of our professed Christianity amounts only to a species of rationalistic skepticism. In the days of the Reformation the Church, the "Spouse of Christ," was still held as "the Jerusalem, which is from above and which is free, the Mother of us all." In our day, this view is abandoned by a large majority of the professed followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now, the Church is an association of men, united together so as to reach certain ends. She is no longer the Body of Christ, into communion with which individual man must come so as to be saved, but she has been, and repeatedly is placed on a level with the humanitarian orders of the day, and it seems to be a sin, for which no penance can be done, to say, that out of her bosom there is no salvation. Besides, holy hands are lifted high, when it is said, that there is a body of men in the Church, specially set apart to minister in holy things, through whom grace is mediated to individual men. This is the burden of the theology of that large school represented by the *New York Tribune* and *New York Independent* and kindred papers. It is wonderful how wide spread this singular theory is, and what advances it makes in undermining the ancient faith. But the truth is, this is not the idea of the Church, as was held in early ages and as presented by the inspired Apostles. In a former article we explained the nature and object of this wonderful kingdom, and also the necessity of belonging to this kingdom for our salvation, which

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

view is here reiterated. The common idea, now generally entertained, is that the Church exists in the order of nature, when it must be clear to every reflecting, earnest mind, that nature and grace are not the same, but present two distinct conceptions. They cannot stand the one for the other, and in nature there are no forces which can possibly effect man's restoration from sin. In this sphere, that is, in nature, we conceive the subject of Revivals, as carried on in our day, to have its place, and on this plane the work of conversion, in this theory, is made to proceed.

GENERAL FACTS.

The idea of a revival includes, as a fact, some disordered, disturbed relation in which man stands to God. There is then a continued effort on the part of this whole family of God to reach a higher position than that occupied naturally, and this is proof of a force which is disturbing, and which has already interfered with the relation in which man originally stood to God. This tendency is found among the heathens, where there is an effort, based on self, made to free the human spirit from the bondage under which it rests. This tendency becomes stronger and clearer as we come into the light of revelation, as seen especially in the Old Testament history. All this makes apparent certain facts, fundamental, because of which, this tendency comes out and the yearning on the part of the human spirit becomes so loud and clear.

1. The fact of man's fall, and hence the depravity of our nature. This fact is universally admitted, but when properly inquired into, it is found that it is held in different ways. It is clear now to see, that much depends on the form in which this fact is held, for if there has not been a falling away from original rectitude so far, that without an interposition from beyond us, in order to the recovery of our nature, man may by his own efforts, in his own way and time, so manipulate himself as at last to suppose himself brought back into a gracious state, or in favor with God. This theory places man's salvation somewhat into his own hands, and on this plane the

revivalism of our day proceeds, and any one reading the narrative of that wonderful work, cannot help but feel, that that whole work moved on that plane, and that it was in letter and in spirit a work similar to the thousand and one, as we have them in our day of revivals of religion. This theory can do without the agency of the Church,—it can do without the Sacraments or even the Christian Ministry, and it is surprising, that a man like Dr. Edwards, good and pious as he has been represented, could allow himself to fall in with a system like this, and that, too, in the face of the life and Confession of his own branch of the Church of Christ. In all those wonderful cases he records, and then the scores which were converted and savingly brought to God, you read not for once a word of the Sacrament of Baptism, or of the Church as a mother into whose bosom we are to be born. It virtually ignores this fact of depravity, though seemingly making much of it, by not even hinting of an act which plants the soul from this miserable state into grace, and it is no wonder that that work excited so much opposition and distrust, and was regarded as an innovation and calculated to be an injury, more than a blessing, to the cause of true, genuine piety and godliness. One thing is clear, that theory is not the theory which the ancient faith held, and besides that, the point is so vital that we dare not allow this faith to change with every turn of wind. Because of this, we have the Confessions, in which the doctrine is so explicitly fixed, that there can be no mistaking it, though for years already it is being toned down, that after awhile there will be a settling into the belief that this nature of ours is not as bad as represented. In the face of this toning down, it is true still, that by the fall man was placed into a position from which he is utterly unable to extricate himself, unless raised into a higher sphere by the Spirit and grace of God.

2. The need of a plan for restoring our fallen life. The effects of the fall must in some way be counterworked and defeated, and ever since sin had entered, God announced redemption, or a plan for recovering that which had been lost. In the garden already, the promise was given, "I will put en-

mity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel." This promise was not to go into fulfillment in a general way, but God selected a family, raised up a people, and to them specially were promises and blessings made. Abraham was selected as the Father of the Faithful, and to him and his posterity, these same promises were repeated, and to them the Lord revealed Himself as He did to no one else.

THE OLD TESTAMENT PLAN.

In the selected people of Abraham and his posterity, we have a community, in which resided a peculiar life. Here God revealed Himself, and in this community God came near to the people and the people near to God. Here was the Tabernacle and all the sacred means employed by God, for the great purpose of saving souls. Not every one born of Jewish parents shared in the full benefits of the Covenant, but, in order to that, had to submit to the rite of initiation, which, in his case, was Circumcision. The meaning of this evidently was, a lifting into a higher order, —an entrance into another order of life for the subject, in which order was to be found and was ever at hand, all that was needed for the unfolding of the spiritual life of the subject. It did make a distinction between the order of nature and that of grace. In this order too, the subject was entitled to all the privileges and blessings which were there at hand, blessings which were not for those on the outside. In the after life, account was ever made of this ingrafting, and because of it, in due time, there was a full participation in all the privileges and blessings of that ancient covenant, God had made with His people. In all this plan there was nothing of this modern theory of making Christians. Nothing like that of Edwards. No insisting on conversion, and systematically ignoring all sacramental acts in the plan of God for recovering man. That theory lifted the subject on to a higher plane, where a Christian character was to be unfolded, that of Edwards and our modern revival theory, lays hold upon the subject in nature and tries to convert him, and regards the advocate of a better sys-

tem as allied with Puseyites and Romanists. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh."

GENERAL RESTORATION IN JESUS CHRIST.

The race, sharing in this general ruin, must now be reconstructed. It must be lifted out of this slough of sin, and elevated on to a higher plane, in which a true, Christian life may be unfolded. This restoration was not accomplished first, by coming to men, individually, and by taking hold, in an isolated way, on the individual life and lifting it up, but, in a general way, by the entrance of a force into the race, which was able to lift it up. There was no power in the race to save it, for we are all corrupt and incapable of doing any good. To do for the race then that which it was wholly unable to do, help came from heaven, and the general restoration of the race—the human family, was effected, when the Lord Jesus Christ became Incarnate, having assumed our nature, and then carrying this fallen life of ours, safely through to victory and freedom, over into heaven where our Lord is our elder Brother and our Advocate with the Father for us. In Jesus Christ, humanity is redeemed,—it is reheaded—reconstructed—recreated, and in the whole Gospel history, and in the individual, Christian life, the Lord Jesus is the great Centre, around which all is made to turn. He is the great pivot on which is poised the whole subject of redemption, and around which all individual hopes and prospects are made to revolve. In this great central fact, the individual life must share, in other words, it must be planted into it, in order that it may have an interest in it, and be also lifted up and restored to life and peace. Our life, as under sin, lies outside of this. Accordingly, there is need for an individual restoration, and this is effected, by being grafted into Christ, who is this great Fountain of Life, or the Restorer of our human life. This our modern theory of Christianity would say, is by conversion at an Anxious Bench, or as Dr. Edwards has it in his narrative, independent of Sacramental Acts, but by some exercises in which the soul engaged, until, as was supposed, that desired end was reached. What a difference

from that as held in former ages, and too by the very denomination in which Edwards labored. Until recently it was held and taught, that our nature shared in this restored one, by making an entrance into the bosom of the Mystical Body of Christ, and that this entrance was made by Sacramental Acts. It had faith in the Church as an order of grace, and did not sneer at acts, so simple, that the rationalistic, skeptical mind, as of old, will say, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat," or, "what can this little water do for the subject to be initiated?"

This fallen, sinful nature was to be grafted into one, freed from the forces of sin. This freed nature we have in Christ Jesus, and into this our poor, fallen life is to be grafted, in order that it may grow and yield fruit. But how? Evidently, not by human agency, but by the interference of a higher world—the world of grace, setting aside the forces of sin, by lifting the subject out of nature, and placing him into other relations, where a Christian character may be unfolded. It should be clear to every one, that this cannot take place on the plane of nature and according to natural laws. It is effected by Baptism, the Sacrament of Regeneration, John chap. iii. Here an order of grace challenges, with forces, not found in the world,—forces sufficient to open the eyes of the spiritually blind, as well as the ears of the deaf, and so bring the soul into a world of grace,—one as real as this present, natural order, in which man is to find his true proper relation to his Maker. As Circumcision, in the Old Testament, introduced the subject into higher relations and brought him into contact with blessings at hand, only in that order, so does the Sacrament of Baptism, by "Water and the Holy Ghost," graft the subject into an order founded in the Person of Jesus Christ,—plants him into another order of life, in which, under conditions, and in the use of means appointed of God, the subject grows up to the stature of a Christian, and is fitted for the higher life, holding in the heavenly world. It is a real act, and does really and truly what it promises, that is, grafting into Christ and planting into grace. This the theory of revivals repudiates and disowns.

It does not claim a share nor lot in it. It is Puseyism, yea worse, it is Romish to affirm it. Holy hands are held up against it.* Ignoring this initial act, it would take subjects to the Anxious Bench, and without any foundation laid, commence the work of converting the soul, and that outright; and without being hampered by these popish yokes, straightway convert them and so fit them for the kingdom of heaven. This is modern. It is a new theory of Christianity, and we hesitate not to say, that it has been immensely mischievous, the amount of which no one can calculate, and has done more harm to the cause of true, genuine piety, than it has ever done good. And furthermore, there is little doubt, but that this very system of Edwards, and as now carried on, with some modifications and improvements, is responsible to a great extent for the sad confusion and disorder into which our Protestantism has fallen and from which it is now suffering. On this plane the narrative of Dr. Edwards proceeds, and there is not a whit of difference, if we except the rigid Calvinism cropping out, every now and then, between this wonderful work and that of modern revivalists, who convert by the score, and at times laugh "their sleeves full" at what then and there takes place. The effect of these operations is the same, and in each case tells with the same blighting result. In proof of this, witness the spiritual condition of that very Massachusetts now, in which all this wonderful work took place, only a little over one century ago. This theory needs no Church, no Sacraments for its work, operation and result; it works on the plane of nature and its results are accordingly.†

---

* An instance, somewhat curious, occurred some time ago, as exposed in the columns of the "Messenger," which is to the point. It is well known, that the German Reformed and that portion of the Lutheran Church, wh'ch remained true to Lutheranism, have held and taught, and still hold and teach, that Baptism does effect what is claimed in all the Confessions of the Reformation, to which some rationalist, who speaks of "the Energetic Presbytery of Westminster," files objections, and speaks of these people, who are the peers of these rationalistic critics, "as living on the lowest verge of evangelical Christianity," and that Reformed and Lutheran Churches abound here. This stigmatized people believe in grace, while these critics wallow in the low plane of skepticism and rationalism.

† Only last winter, a Boston correspondent in the N. Y. Tribune reports, that in Boston, the "hub of the Universe," Rev. O. B. Frothingham, delivered a lecture,

To show now that this is new,—that it is modern, let us look at the Confessions on this subject. In the Westminster Confession, the Confession of the Church of Edwards, we have the subject presented differently, from what it is in his narrative. "Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ, *not only* for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, *but also* to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life." * * * So also their Liturgy on the same subject. Now in reading the narrative of Edwards, there is not the least intimation of a compliance with this ancient faith. Not one word of Baptism, as a seal of the ingrafting into Christ. In that whole narrative there is no intimation of any preparation, but it leaves the impression, that it commenced in nature and ended there. There is no doubt that the reaction which sets in after the excitement is over, is far worse than the disease, as the sequel of that work abundantly shows. Another very important confession, reflecting the sense of the Church in reformation days, we have in the Augsburg Confession. "Concerning Baptism we teach that it is a necessary ordinance; that through *the same grace is offered*, and that it ought also to be administered to children, who are thereby dedicated to God, and received into His favor." Art. IX. Baptism. Even the Methodist Catechism condemns the practice of the Methodists. "What is the inward grace signified in Baptism? A death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness." Our own Heidelberg Catechism utters no indistinct sound on that subject, though the Reformed "are living on the lowest verge of Evangelical Christianity." Indeed there is but one voice on this subject, before and in reformation days, though Edwards broke away from his confession, and a large

---

on the subject, "The beliefs of the Unbelievers: The faith of the Infidel," to a "large audience drawn from the thinking and cultured men and women of Boston." A singular commentary on the permanent result of this wonderful work of Edwards. Perhaps the "Spirit" had withhrawn, as Dr. Edwards shows in this narrative, when the revival closed.

portion of the Lutheran Church repudiated the Lutheran Confession. This testimony cannot be gainsaid, and it is clear, that if our Protestantism had remained true to the theory of these confessions, and faithfully carried it out, instead of giving it up and then bartering it away or selling itself to a foreign spirit, ignoring everything that is supernatural, as Dr. Edwards himself shows in his book, it would have been far better for the interest itself, and our Protestantism would not present the sorry spectacle it does in our day.* If there is one thing clear above others, it is the fact that Ancient Christianity—the Reformers held that our spiritual life commenced in Baptism, the Sacrament of Regeneration, and on that ground or foundation, our Christian development is to take place. In our modern theory of Christianity this fact is unquestionably ignored, and what is worse, it is treason, in the estimation of the guardians of this sacred interest, to affirm it. This truth has been once and again exemplified in the crusade against the Reformed Church, and the studied contempt in which she is held by many of the larger Protestant sects.† In the theory now prevailing, in three-fourths of our Protestantism, there is the jumbling together of facts, and because of it are making "confusion worse confounded." The burden is, you must be converted, you must be regenerated, you must experience a change of heart. In this theory these two facts, Regeneration and Conversion, are regarded as the same, and often the terms are so employed as to mean the same thing. "Conversion is a great and glorious work of God's power, at once changing the heart and infusing life into the dead soul. * * *" "That conversion is a great change, wherein *old things are done away and all things become new*," &c. *Narrative by Dr. Edwards*, pp. 53 and 54. What another world this, as presented in "*Sadler's Second Adam*,"

* Recently a Committee from the Evangelical Alliance attempted to recommend its peculiar freedom of Evangelical Christianity to the Emperor of Russia, but were so completely "snubbed before the matter came to head-quarters, that prudence dictated a retreat."

† Some years ago correspondence between the Presbyterian and the Reformed Church was broken off because of certain leanings to Romanism, as seen by eyes not fixed in sockets belonging to those living on the lowest verge of Evangelical Christianity, but in the land of rationalistic skepticism.

"Regeneration and Conversion are two different terms, differently derived, presenting two different ideas:—The one *birth*, at the commencement of a life; the other, *turning* in the middle of a walk. They are never interchanged in Scripture," p. 25. Let any one look at the definition of Conversion as given by Dr. Edwards. Is it any wonder that we have confusion in religion, or that rationalism is in the ascendant? How wholly unlike the theory as advocated in the Confession to which he was to be faithful and true.

In the theory which makes no account of the Church, as the mystical body of Christ, and which holds it next to Romanism to say that it is necessary to belong to the Church in order to salvation, and this idea is widespread, the fact of ingrafting into Christ, of Regeneration, as these confessions have it, has no force. All that you need is to be converted. How different the old time-honored theory, before the Scotch innovation came in, which steadily held the Church as an order of grace, from heaven, holding in the person of Jesus Christ, and in the world, an evolution of His life on to the full consummation. Into the bosom of this order the soul is to be born "by water and the Spirit" (Jno. iii.) having this life mediated by the living minister. Here is the commencement of this spiritual life, and then in the use of the blessed means of grace, this life expands itself, as the life in the mustard seed, in the Parable of our Lord. Now in this light you may understand what Conversion is; that it is not the commencement, but a turning in our life, as Sadler has it, and that it is something vastly different from what it is held in our day by the friends of the "New Measure System," as well as that entertained by Dr. Edwards in his narrative. Dr. Edwards studiedly ignored the Church, also the Sacrament of Baptism, and the very name occurs but once or twice in the narrative of this wonderful work of grace, spread over 101 pages. There is no planting into grace, as taught by Christ to Nicodemus, in the Sacrament of Baptism. Not one word of it. It is conversion all the while, outside of the means, as is practiced in our day. The same is true of the Anxious Bench system, as practiced by its friends in our day. In the

tract by Dr. Nevin, exposing the system, you enter another world. You are made to feel that you breathe in another atmosphere. No wonder that it was so bitterly assailed on all sides by the friends of the new system, for it was in truth an earnest attempt to vindicate the order of the old faith, as advocated by the educational theory of religion, and bearded, in the very height of its glory, "the lion in his own den." It was a solemn protest against an innovation, and was an attack on a system which was fraught with mischief, and the virus infused into the whole Protestant body, caused a species of spiritual paralysis, from which the whole interest is now suffering so severely. Even where this baneful theory is not practiced it is still true, that its influence has been felt, and among those reared under a far better system, there is often a mistrust and an unwillingness to enter the Church, in order to do duty, because, forsooth, they are not converted, or have not felt thus and so. In this way it, itself being impotent, has wrought vast mischief, and is to be regarded with suspicion and fraught with danger to the cause of true religion.

THE THEORY OF REVIVALS IN MODERN TIMES.

Revivals, as they are in vogue now, are of recent origin. They were unknown in the days of the Reformation. Scotch Presbyterianism knew nothing of them. Even John Wesley never dreamed of an Anxious Bench revival. Indeed it is styled "*New* Measure," a new invention to convert sinners.

What is a revival of religion in the modern sense? It is an effort made in a special way, to convert sinners as well as saints,* by singing and praying over them. The means of grace, as ordered by God, indeed, have no place in this system.†

---

* In some places these meetings are held regularly every winter, when the nights are long, and often members, having been in connection with the Church for years, are converted, and in the course of a few years are reconverted and so on, once and again.

† . . . A sermon usually goes before. But frequently this has no felt relation at all to the subsequent excitement, so far as its actual contents are concerned. The writer was present, not a great while ago, as a stranger, in a church where a preacher of some little note in connection with the subject of revivals, had been introduced

It lies on the outside. The opposite, educational system, is regarded as one making cold, heartless professors, educating the head, but leaving the heart cold and unconverted. Hence the constant cry, you must be converted, and that at an Anxious Bench, and some ministers, plying this trade, go so far as to say, that there is no conversion but in this way, and that, unless it is at an Anxious Bench, there is no salvation for the soul. With a system like this, it is proposed to convert the world, and withstand rationalism, skepticism, and infidelity. Under the working of this system Christianity commenced a decline, and communities and congregations where the system has been in use, are showing the bad spectacle of disorder and weakness and a consequent decline of religion.* What makes the case sadder still, is the fact, that this system has, and is still eating out the life of the old ancient system of religion, and is undermining the confidence of the people in it, that this too is seriously threatened, and the danger is towards rationalism and skepticism, as the author of the article referred to, of the "Energetic Westminster Presbytery," himself furnishes an example. The modern revivalist has torn himself loose from the old confessions and the old reformation theory of religion, as all instances and places in which the system flourished fully show. And we now deduce from these facts the following points upon which this pernicious theory proceeds.

1. That we have ample resources, in ourselves, to reach the end proposed in religion. The theory lays much stress on our depravity. Examples of this are abundant in this narrative by Dr. Edwards. What is wanted now is to have appliances brought to bear on the subject, in order to make the resources that are here available. The system sees no need of an in-

---

under the expectation and hope that something of the kind might be secured at the time by his instrumentality. The congregation had but little appearance of life at the beginning, and still less as the sermon drew towards its close. The truth is, it was a dull discourse at the best. . . . A number were fairly asleep, and others were bordering on the same state, &c.—"*Anxious Bench,*" p. 40.

* It is a notorious fact that in Anxious Bench communities the young can scarcely be induced to attend catechetical instruction, neither have they confidence in the Bench to be converted, and hence remain aloof and out of the pale of the Church.

grafting into a better stock, and if you talk of it, there are suspicious looks already, for fear some popish lore might show itself. It needs no outward help, but only to have the Holy Spirit to operate upon the heart, and convert it. The foundation for a pious life is self-laid, and is at hand, and needs not to be made by Divine agency. What is wanted is Conversion only, in order to make the subject a true child of God. This, unquestionably, is the theory of Dr. Edwards, and it may be somewhat above the level of our modern revivalism, but it is of the same type, and in reality is the same theory. In that wonderful narrative, in which we are told so many souls were hopefully converted, (we hope they were, but the work was done in a way, Scotch Presbyterianism knew nothing about, as is evident from the opposition the system and the course of Edwards met with from the better thinking portion of the ministry and membership of the Presbyterian Church in that part of Massachusetts),* there is not one word said of the engrafting of this old, corrupt nature, into a better stock. Not one word of laying a foundation, by sacramental acts, whereon to develop a Christian character and lead a pious life. It leaves the subject precisely where it finds him, that is, in nature, and here lays hold upon him and manipulates him, until, at last, it is graciously hoped, that there has been a passage for him from death into life. This is the theory underlying the narrative of Dr. Edwards, and stands in glaring opposition to the doctrine of his own Church, as clearly set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith. What else is it but putting the subject into the hands of the individual himself, the Pelagianism of old, standing in strange contrast with the Scotch Calvinism, the ruling force in Scotch Presbyterianism? And this is the rule still. In our day the theory is not changed, and it is a notorious fact that the whole school of the Anxious Bench, or of

---

* "The error of those who have had ill thoughts of the great religious operations on the minds of men that have been carried on of late in New England," &c. . . . "Some have greatly erred in the way in which they have gone about to try this work, whether it be a work of God," . . . &c. *Revival of Religion in New England,* p. 107.

New Measureism is decidedly unchurchly, and lays no stress on any of the Sacramental acts as obtaining in the Church.* This idea of Conversion, falsely held by Edwards, when he speaks of it "as a great and glorious work of God's power, at once changing the heart and infusing life into the dead soul," is carried so far that persons who have been born "of water and of the Spirit," and who in due time ratified these vows and covenant engagements with the Lord by an open profession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and who faithfully endeavor to live a pious and holy life, are regarded with suspicion, and are often spoken of by these pharisaic hypocrites as unconverted, simply, because they never allowed themselves to be drawn to an unmeaning Anxious Bench. That these resources are only natural, and lie in nature, is seen from the unchristian, uncharitable spirit, which universally accompanies the system, furnishing evidence that this fallen nature has not been lifted into a higher sphere, that it is not planted into grace, but has been operated upon only in nature. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit."

2. These resources, as they are in nature, must now be excited and, in some way, be called out. As some old member once remarked, "we must be roused," and this is the burden of the song. "You must be converted. This drowsy nature must be excited and roused out of its drowsiness." Under the old system or theory, it used to be, this old nature, or this old Adam, must be grafted into Christ, then become submissive to the will of God and of His Lord, and obedient in the use of blessed means appointed of God, in order to a pious and holy life. These resources are often called out, 1, By the preaching of the law and God's sovereignty. This was the plan of Ed-

---

* A case is known to the writer where a minister was asked to baptize a sick child but declined doing so, and giving as comfort to the parent, that it would be of no use nor service to the child at any rate. Then again, no stress is laid on the ordinance of Baptism, from the fact that ministers are so accommodating to the whims and caprices of foolish people that at a certain baptism the rite was performed, at the same time and place in *four different* ways. Verily this is confusion, and an accommodation with a vengeance.

wards.* In his hands the law was to be a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ. But how different the result from that of Paul and others in the Acts of the Apostles. In their case they were led to cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do," to which they were answered, "*Repent and be Baptized*, every one of you, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." They submitted to the ordained means of grace, and were thus introduced into the mystical Body of Christ, while in the case of Edwards and our modern revivalists, by their theory, they are converted, and some are left without ever receiving Baptism. These natural resources are so wrought upon by outward appliances, and when the outward forces are withdrawn, in numberless instances, the subjects are found precisely where they started from. There is not a lifting into a higher sphere, into a higher order by the Spirit of God in the use of the means, but the attempt is made to build, without a proper foundation, and the structure becomes insecure and finally falls. But in our modern revivals, specially, 2, By external appeals to the affections. These are sought to be excited and called out, not so much by the plain and simple truths of the gospel, as by the appeals made to the affections, exciting fear of punishment, painting the misery of the damned and so on. And in a promiscuous audience, the attempt is easily successful, and often a wonderful excitement is produced, and a wonderful work of grace is made to follow.† In how many instances, however, does not the work end in excitement, and when the smoke of

* "I think I have found that no discourses have been more remarkably blessed than those in which the doctrine of God's absolute sovereignty with regard to the salvation of sinners, and His just liberty with regard to answering the prayers or succeeding the pains of mere natural men, continuing such, have been insisted on. *Narrative*, p. 40.

† We have a remarkable instance in Mr. Bolton, that noted minister of the Church of England, who, being awakened by the preaching of the famous Mr. Perkins, minister of Christ, in the University of Cambridge, was subject to such terrors as threw him to the ground, and caused him to roar with anguish, and the pangs of the new birth in him were such that he lay pale and without sense, like one dead. . . . "and we have a remarkable instance in the life of Mr. George Trosse, written by himself . . . of terrors occasionally, by awakenings of conscience, so overpowering the body as to deprive, for some time, of the use of reason."—*Revival of Religion in New England*, p. 127.

the excitement is gone, and a calm survey is made, there are left as facts, a wide waste, burned over, and there ARE LEFT standing the charred remains, with the life and vigor wasted and often destroyed. As the author of the tract, *Anxious Bench*, forcibly remarks, "These last had strength, but it was such as a wasting fever imparts to a sick man, opening the way for a long prostration afterwards." "A whole congregation may be moved with excitement, and yet be losing at the very time more than is gained in a religious point of view," pp. 34, 36. Is not this the mournful result of that great work of Dr. Edwards in New England? What is the religious condition of New England now? Why in the "Hub of the Universe," a certain Mr. Frothingham, as the *New York Tribune* reported, delivered a lecture, to the refined, cultured people, the hall nearly full, on the singularly strange subject, "The Beliefs of the Unbelievers: The Faiths of the Infidels." So in the history of congregations where this system is in vogue,—the earnest religious life is eaten out, and in nineteen-twentieths, the spiritual condition is made worse by it, instead of being the great power and wisdom of God. Instead of being the lever of Archimedes, whereby to lift these cold, lifeless Churches into life, it has proven itself absolutely a source of weakness and a means of doing immense harm to the cause of true, genuine religion and piety. And now what follows from these facts which cannot be gainsaid: This, not only has it no force of itself to accomplish these mighty results aimed at, because of its false position, but it eats out the very life of religion in any community, and generally, you find large majorities of unbaptized, unconverted persons, owning no membership in any branch of the Protestant Church, but are out in the world, practical unbelievers and infidels. But this is not all; where this theory prevails, its influence has been of the same pernicious kind, even on those who stand in the other system, that of sacramental grace and educational religion. It seems to be difficult for individuals to believe in a world of grace near at hand in the Person of Jesus Christ, which challenges the confidence and trust of men, and now, this modern theory,

ignoring all this, so undermines and gradually works its way into the hearts of good, honest people, that after a while their faith gives way, and they become indifferent and unconcerned. Catechization is a slow way of making Christians, having for its base already earnest culture and training in the Christian family, educational religion is given to the winds, the baptismal covenant is regarded indifferently, there is to be no nurture, and all that is to be done, is patiently to wait for the cold weather, and long winter evenings, when some "big meeting," will be started, where precious souls are disturbed and misled, instead of being led to submission and obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to lead a quiet, peaceable and holy life. It cannot be denied, that this theory of religion has been of incalculable mischief, and there can be little doubt, that to its door, to a great extent, the state of religion in our Protestant world is to be laid and for which it may be justly held responsible. Who cannot see the difference? Had the old theory been accepted and followed by Edwards, and then a faithfulness in the family to children covenanted with God in Sacramental acts, and from thence into the Church by earnest, faithful instruction, thus carrying on the work from the family, who cannot see that great and glorious results would of necessity have followed? Here there would have been a recognized base, formed by the Holy Ghost, upon which an enduring house could be erected. How much better that, than the cold, chilling rationalism of him, who stigmatizes this theory by saying, that those who embrace it "are living on the lowest verge of evangelical Christianity." We prefer it, decidedly, to the rationalism and specious skepticism of the day.

The theory now resting in these premises, it follows that it repudiates, *in the first place*, Faith in the Church as a Divine Institution. What need for such an order? What need for the Church of Jesus Christ? Dr. Edwards and the modern revivalists want souls converted, certainly. With them this wonderful kingdom of God is of little force. Is not every thing needed, at hand in the subject, in the natural man? So that all that is wanted is to work it out by his own exertions,

and make his way up to righteousness and holiness. But now, is it not true, that Holy Scripture holds up the Church as the Mother, into whose bosom we are to be born, in order that we may have spiritual life? And was not this the theory of early Christianity, from the very start? And was not the Church thus regarded in the days of the Reformation? And does not the Church become the very Mother, the Jerusalem from above, giving us spiritual life, and in her bosom nourishing and supporting this life? She is thus truly the Ark of Safety, in which only security is found, and in whose communion only, our spiritual destiny can be reached. She comes as an Article for faith, appealing to us and demanding submission to her claims in order to salvation. Not so in the theory of our modern revivalism. This theory would call the old order priestly tyranny,—interposing between the individual subject and his God, and would throw up holy hands, and feel terrible horror, making the soul to shudder. It does not want to know anything of this order. It has to do directly with God, and therefore, what is required, is submission to the Anxious Bench and become converted. It is strange that Dr. Edwards, as a follower of John Knox, could make so little account of the Church and her ordinances, in the narrative of this wonderful work of grace, and on this score it is on a parallel with the theory of revivals as we have them in our own day. It needs no Church, no Sacraments, all that it wants is to have the soul converted. It needs no Mother—no Ark of Safety.

But in *the second place*, it repudiates faith in her ordained means. The Church has means for regeneration and for nourishing the Divine life implanted in the soul by the Holy Ghost. In what opposition the theory stands, has been seen already in the use of the terms regeneration and Conversion. Take the idea of Dr. Edwards, where he calls conversion * * "a great change wherein old things are done away and all things become new," and there is clearly a misapprehension of the whole system and the after work is accordingly. It is even decidedly opposed to the system of the Scotch Church, for there the system of the Catechism and catechization were in vogue.

Now this old faith has been given up. In this theory there is no need of Baptism, as an initial act,—the natural heart needs not to be grafted, but converted,—there is really no stress laid on revelation, but you have only the echo of that which is revealed, and the consequence is, confusion worse confounded. Who does not know, that in revivals, little stress is laid on preaching the Word—the sermon has but little place, the success depends on excitement and confusion? It stands in the stream in which a great part of our Modern Christianity now stands, which takes the Bible, and draws from thence as much as it can, through its own private judgment and then leaves to the winds the rest. To talk of the necessity of entering the Church—of the necessity of Baptism—to say that not every one that has the printed volume, called the Bible, has the true Word of God, is branded as squinting towards popery and is regarded as opposed to true piety and godliness. The converted soul, furthermore needs no Lord's Supper, to sustain the Divine life in the soul; what it needs in its converted state is, to sing and pray. How different this, from the teachings of the old Confessions, in which was confessed "one Baptism for the remission of sin," one Holy Supper to nourish and sustain the inner life—the Word of God, in the Church, as the sure Lamp to guide the soul into a peaceful haven. Not so now, in this modern Confession. We have a different theory of Christianity, a new method of converting souls, and sending them over into heaven. The long, rigid road of self-denial, submission and obedience to the means God ordained in His Church for reaching this end, is too tedious and old-fashioned, and must be given up for something better and of later style. It is no wonder that these divinely-ordained means have fallen into disuse. No longer, in our modern theory, do you hear the hearty "Praise God for His Word," heard after reading the Lesson in the regular service. No longer are children brought to the font, at the altar, for ingrafting into Christ, through Holy Baptism, and the Lord's Supper is a usage of great antiquity, but possessing no divine, heavenly grace, (O no that would be popish,) and hence may easily be dispensed with. No wonder that our modern

Christianity staggers and reels before the attacks of the world and of the devil, when there is a public teaching from the pulpit and in the Sunday School, thus training early and often, that the Church is not necessary to salvation, and that her ordinances are not necessarily binding. Under this *regimé* it is not difficult to foretell what the consequences must, in the end, be. It is a matter of great gratification and for devout thanksgiving, that the German Reformed Church has stood out nobly against these innovations, and she specially deserves the title of "the Gibraltar of Protestantism," and she may well bear the accusation of being on the lowest verge of Evangelical Christianity, which is brought against her by rationalists and specious skeptics, and she may well stand firm, assured that this rock, on which she rests, has been tried and has the promise too, "that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her," while the opposition must ultimately give over, as the history of the New England orthodoxy clearly demonstrates.

In *the third place*, it repudiates Faith in the Christian Ministry. The minister is an ambassador from Christ, and hence his holy ordination, his special setting apart for the work of the ministry. Any one can preach, and undertake the work of converting souls.* In this view the minister is only as a common member, and it is priestly again, to say that he is an accredited ambassador for Christ, even though Paul said so. For any authority to interfere and to stand between the soul of the individual and his God, is horrible, and becomes, in the language of some one, "Small potatoes and few in a hill." That is the estimate placed on it, and under this sense, men can live in the world without the Church, without the means of grace, and yet confidently expect at last to go over into heaven. That is the theory which obtains now, but it unquestionably was not the theory held in early days, nor by the reformation worthies. It reverses the whole order, it makes *intellectus precedit fidem*, instead of *fides precedit intellectum*. Our age does

* Students from college, perhaps half way through their classical course, at times pray, preach and pronounce the benediction. So lay-members, at times, carry on a work of grace with great success in converting souls.

not want to be hampered—does not wish to be under restraint or submission, and to have the Christian minister, as the ambassador for Christ, to interfere or in any way mediate, is more than can well be endured. It can engage in the work of conversion, without the Church, it can do it without the ordained minister, it can carry on the life in the soul independent of means. That is the order of the system now, generally prevailing.

GENERAL RESULTS.

It needs no prophet's eye to see that a system, such as this is, must bring results according to its own laws. These are patent wherever the system prevails. One thing is clear, it has undermined the old system of Evangelical Christianity, in which the Catechism has its home and place, so that catechization has fallen into disuse and is regarded as a "fossil relic." It has brought indifference into the family, and now persons grow up in families without Baptism, by which they have "signed and sealed over to them" promised blessings, and by implication, are taught to believe and expect, that in some way they must be converted, that is, that some strange feeling must come over them, and that by lightning and thunder, they must be changed and better persons made out of them. Hence the oft-repeated saying, something of which is found in the narrative by Dr. Edwards, "I don't feel as I ought to feel," or "I don't feel as those, who are to be examples, say they feel." Hence they wait until they feel thus and so, and hence also, scores live out of the Church, without Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and die outside of the Covenant. In all this, it is forgotten, that God is not so much in the storm and earthquake as in the still, small voice, in the silent, quiet, but really powerful means of grace. It may be said that such a result is strange, that there must be weakness in that ancient system, because it succumbs thus easily to this modern challenge, to which it may be replied, that as the system appeals to the reason and feeling, it is easier for the natural heart to fall in with and accept it. It seems to be somewhat difficult for persons to believe the mysteries of grace as offered in Jesus

Christ, and then are at once ready to winnow out all mystery and accept only that which the reason can grasp and the understanding can apprehend. As an illustration, take the case of infant Baptism; Reason cannot understand how the child can be benefited in the ordinance, just as it cannot understand how Christ could bless the little unconscious children by laying His hands on them, and hence the grace is denied, the Sacrament refused, and the mind settles in skeptical unbelief. So in the case in hand.

1. There is, by this system and in this theory, a lowering of the scheme of redemption, making that which is supernatural only natural. Christianity never proposed such a plan. It is not natural, but supernatural. It came from heaven, and claims to have all the powers and forces that are needed to recover lost and ruined man from guilt and sin. To do that, it lays hold of the subject, apprehends him, and lifts him from a state of nature to a state of grace,—places him where he is directly confronted with the supernatural, to which, he is now challenged to become submissive and obedient. It brings him on to a plane higher than mere nature, expressed in the Confessions and by St. Paul, in the wonderful ingrafting into Christ, and here a Christian life is to be unfolded and the fruits thereof produced. But this modern theory knows nothing of that. An individual is far sunk on the extreme verge of Evangelical Christianity, when he speaks of a side that is mystical, appealing to the higher man, even to faith—when he speaks of a world of grace which is truly supernatural. This in the ears of this theory sounds like Hebrew. This modern theory, then we say, lowers the whole order. It refuses to believe in mystery, nor in Sacramental grace, but brings the whole scheme, down to that low plane on which we are by nature. You see it in all the modern movements to make Christianity popular, such as preaching in theatres, street preaching, and various other contrivances, to bring, as it is said, the gospel to the masses. The idea that you must bow to the order of grace or perish is scouted, and the pathway of the sinner must be made as comfortable as possible. What

else is this but lowering the whole scheme, putting it on the plane of nature and making this impression, that the Church is only a convenience for some people—that her ministers are a set of silly priests—the ministry priestcraft,—that her Sacraments are less than the grips and signs of Masons and Odd Fellows? Is it not so? Let us look it clear in the face. What another world is opened in the sermons of the ancient Fathers. How sublimely simple, and yet withal how infinitely grand, the story of the Cross as portrayed by them. Here is the plan—this is the order. Become submissive and obedient to it and you shall have salvation; disobey, refuse to submit, and you shall be damned. There is a sublimity, yea, a dignity, in the Gospel as held by our fathers before us, for which you seek in vain in this new theory, as you find it in new measures.

2. In this theory, the idea is, that you can reach in the natural what can only be reached in the supernatural. The theory holds nothing that is supernatural. Even the party speaking of the energetic Westminster Presbytery, and ridiculing and shedding crocodile tears over the poor deluded Lutheran and Reformed members, sunk to the lowest verge, who, however, believe in an order above nature, he, standing in this system, by implication, holds that the natural is sufficient for our salvation. On this plane the work of evangelizing the world is attempted. The Tract Societies, Sunday School Unions, stand here on a common platform. In proof, take the large and influential body of Presbyterians, in which is found the energetic Westminster Presbytery, and how very few baptisms (in their Confession "the sign and seal of regeneration, of ingrafting into Christ") are reported. What little account is not made of the Church, as shown by the low conceptions held of this wonderful kingdom of God. But not only here; the theory is wide-spread even where there is no Anxious Bench employed. Supernatural grace is repudiated, and the plane of nature furnishes the great field on which the work is carried on and the salvation of souls is secured. The great facts in the life of Christ are unmeaning in this theory, and the work of redemption breaks off at the death of Christ, and the Re-

deemer becomes somewhat like an absent one to His people, when the truth is, that as the Great High Priest, He carries on the glorious work until He will come the second time. In this supernatural order the work is carried forward in the use of means, lifting man out from sin more and more, redeeming that which is under the curse, until at last the whole creation shall be redeemed and brought into harmony, in which all were when they came from the hand of God. In this modern theory you hear of no Sacramental acts; indeed these acts are often discouraged; it takes the subject where he is in nature, and operates upon him in the use of the Anxious Bench, and here expects that, which is promised only, as you are lifted above nature, and placed in a relation where the higher blessings of grace are at hand. It starts in nature and ends there.

3. Under the influence of this theory you are brought to the level of humanitarianism. That is a tendency, too, which in our day has set in. The Gospel is designed for the general brotherhood. It is to be shaped so as to fit and suit it wherever found. Speak of a world of grace in which not every one is, and you are uncharitable—why, the Gospel is for all Say that salvation is offered only to those who become obedient—to those who are "born of water and of the Spirit," and so receive the rite of initiation, through the accredited organ, and you begin to trench on individual privileges and rights. It cannot brook the spirit of uncharitableness, but glories "in that charity which is kind and envieth not," and yet the same spirit lauds and glorifies the act in and by which the Papal Church was robbed of rights and privileges which belonged to her through long centuries, as if the act would bear justification in the light of justice and right. But right is right—wrong is wrong. No wonder that it cannot comprehend ecclesiastical rights, and that it looks on the Church as an order, having men in her to tyrannize over the consciences of individuals. It seems to be a new world, enlightened indeed, but it is a question whether it commands an eminence from which great moral and spiritual blessings are to come. The scheme repudiates everything that is distinctive,—it winnows out the

supernatural element, brings the whole down to the level of humanitarianism, with a strong tendency to unbelief, skepticism and infidelity.

In our present position—in the circumstances in which our common Protestantism is found, it is not necessary to give it up and go back to the Papal Church, in order to solve the problem. We go forward, not backward. That would be cowardly and would bring no relief. The Church of Rome, no doubt, will be brought into fearful trials, evidences of which are now appearing. Her temporal power is forever gone. The wonderful movement in Germany, no one can foresee what it will accomplish. But Protestantism, unquestionably occupies a position far in advance of the Church of Rome. With this let us be satisfied. But let us not, as its chosen friends, suppose that it is all complete—that it has no defects. Let us see them and own them, and then in the spirit of our common Master labor for their removal. One thing is certain, that if the friends of Protestantism were united and could see eye to eye and go hand in hand, the habitations of cruelty would soon be changed and the effects of the blessed Gospel everywhere appear.

So in reference to this theory of religion. If the Protestant Church had been true to the theory of educational religion—if the subject had been regarded a child of God when it entered into Covenant by Baptism, and then nurtured and trained in the family, and then in the Church, who cannot see the great results that would have followed? And to this, in the end, it must come. A large and intelligent portion of the Methodist Church is insisting on the use of their Catechism, and request it to be taught by the ministry to the people, and in the Sunday School to the young. And this spirit must lay hold on minds and hearts, and the old, educational system be restored to its place in the family and in the Church, so that the Church may meet the subject at his very entrance into the world and take him up by Sacramental acts, that he may be reared and trained in her bosom for heaven, by passing from the family to the School, from the School to the Church, and from the Church to Heaven.

ART. VI.—THE CIRCUMCISION OF CHRIST.

BY REV. WM. RUPP, A.M., BERLIN, PA.

CIRCUMCISION was the sign and seal of God's Covenant under the Law, as Holy Baptism is under the Gospel. The account of the institution of the ordinance is contained in Gen. xvii. 1–14. When Abraham, whose name hitherto had been Abram, was ninety years old, and nine, the Lord appeared to him and said: "I am the Almighty God; walk before me and be thou perfect. . . . . And I will establish My Covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. . . . . This is My Covenant, which ye shall keep, between Me and you, and thy seed after thee: *Every man child among you shall be circumcised.* And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a *token* of the Covenant betwixt Me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generation, he that is born in thy house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not thy seed. . . . And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people."

This account presupposes that circumcision was practiced before, either as a religious rite or from sanitary considerations; and history also affords evidence of such practice previous to the time of Abraham (Herzog's Real Enc., Vol. II., p. 109). But now the rite receives a higher significance than it had before. It becomes now the token of God's Covenant. There is nothing at all strange in the fact that a rite or ceremony with which Abraham may have been acquainted previously, and which was practiced afterwards even by idolatrous nations, like the Egyptians, Phœnicians and Æthiopians, should have

been employed as a sacred or sacramental ordinance in the religion of the Old Testament; for Baptism also, the initiatory Sacrament of the Christian religion, was preceded and foreshadowed by lustrations or washings of various kinds both among Jews and Gentiles. In fact all divine ordinances are based upon natural, human customs and practices. God lays hold upon these, raises them above the sphere of nature by investing them with new ideas, and so transforms them into religious ordinances and channels of grace. In this way circumcision came to be the token and initiatory Sacrament of the Covenant.

The covenant is not a promise or vow on the part of man, nor is it a contract or bargain between God and man. It does not proceed from man; nor does it proceed from God *and* man, as though they were equal parties. It proceeds from God alone. God, who in connection with the establishment of the covenant for the first time calls Himself the *Almighty*, the God of all power, besides whom there is none other, is the author of the covenant. He says, "*I* will establish *My* covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee." In the covenant God places Himself in a new and gracious relation to sinful men. This relation is new, because it is something superadded to the natural relation which holds between God as the Creator and man as the creature; and gracious, because it is concerned with man in his fallen, sinful state, and looks to his recovery and salvation. Sin is separation from God. When man, made in the image and likeness of God, aspired to be as God, that is, independent of God, he tore himself away from God, cut himself loose from God, the ground of his life, became *godless* (*gottless* in German), and so fell under the law of death and him that had the power of death, even the devil. God, however, does not suffer him to perish. And as the conservation of the old natural relation, the covenant of works as it has been called, would not suffice for the restoration and salvation of the sinner, God enters into a new relation with him, or establishes a new covenant with him and for him. The essential contents or grace of this covenant, as announced to

Abraham, is contained in the promise, "I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Now God is, of course, the God of all men, but He is the God of Abraham, and of Israel, the covenant people, in a sense different from that in which He is the God of all men. He is the Creator, Preserver and Judge of all, but He is the Redeemer and Saviour of Israel. His relation to this people is different from His relation to the Egyptians and Canaanites. And that which distinguishes this people at every stage of their history is the covenant, whose sign and seal they bear in their flesh.

Circumcision was the *initiatory* ordinance of the covenant. Wherever circumcision was duly performed according to the divine will and appointment, there was the covenant; and wherever circumcision was not thus performed, there the covenant was not. Circumcision secured an entrance into the covenant, and a share in the blessings, privileges, and obligations of God's people. Israelitish children were not born into the covenant. They were not born members of the theocracy, as little as the children of Christian parents are now born members of the Church. In this regard the children of Israelitish parents were on an equality only with the children of strangers; as is evident from Gen. xvii. 13, "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised: and My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." The Lord makes no difference between the son born in the house, and the son of the stranger bought with money. If the former is not circumcised at the proper time, he is as little regarded as being in the covenant as the latter. "The uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken (neglected) My covenant." So closely, moreover, are the sign and the thing signified connected together, that the one is directly identified with the other. "My covenant shall be in your flesh." Of course, the sign or token is meant; but that in inseparable connection with the covenant itself, so that where the former is, the latter must be also, and where the former is not, the latter cannot be either. The children of

Israelitish parents had a right to circumcision, and parents might sin by neglecting it. But a right or title here is not identical with the possession of the thing itself. The children of Christian parents have a right to Baptism; they ought to be baptized. But some on principle, and some through mere carelessness, do not have them baptized. Are such children nevertheless to be regarded as though they were baptized, and as though they possessed all the blessings and privileges usually communicated and guaranteed only through Baptism? The children of Christian parents also have a right to Christian training and nurture. But some parents neglect that, and suffer their children to grow up in ignorance and sin. Are such children now to be regarded nevertheless as having been brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? No. The right, here, as elsewhere, and the realization of that right are different things. The children of Jewish parents were entitled to the enjoyment of the blessings of the covenant along with their parents; but their entrance into the covenant and actual enjoyment of those blessings, were conditioned by their circumcision. Circumcision was for them, as well as for the children of the stranger, the door of entrance into the covenant.

The general substance or grace of the covenant, as we have already intimated, was that relation of God to the covenant people corresponding to the promise given to Abraham, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." While God suffers other nations to walk in their own ways, and to serve the gods of their own invention, he chooses Israel for His inheritance and makes His abode among them. He is *their* God, and they are *His* people. "Ye are the children of the Lord your God," says Moses in Deut. xiv. 1. And again: "Thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord has chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth." All the blessings and promises of the covenant with Israel, however, gather themselves up ultimately in the Messiah, that seed of Abraham in which all the nations of the earth are to be blessed. If there could have been a failure of the promise in regard to the coming of

Christ, then there would have been a failure also of every other promise. But there could be no failure. The covenant involved from the beginning the divine guarantee and pledge of the fulfillment of this promise of all promises. In fact the Christological idea, which was to be realized in the fullness of time, was working from the beginning, as the active, moving principle of development in the history of the covenant. As in every movement of history the end is involved potentially in the beginning, the final cause being also the efficient or moving cause, so also was it here. Here we see how there could be real divine grace, real supernatural life and light, in the old covenant before the actual coming of Christ; for whatever grace it contained, was in it only in consequence of the relation in which it stood from the beginning to that seed of the woman, who was coming to bruise the serpent's head. As the life that produces the fruit of the tree is working in the organism before the actual production of the fruit, so the idea of Christ, as a power of life, was savingly active throughout the whole history of the Old Testament. That it could not *then* issue in the complete and full salvation of individuals, is of course evident from the nature of the case, and is taught also by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; for after having spoken of the heroes of faith in the Old Testament times, the writer says: "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. xi. 39, 40. The Old Testament saints, having embraced the promise by faith, were kept unto salvation to be revealed in the fullness of time. Believing the promise, they possessed in the way of anticipation and hope, what the Christian now possesses as a present reality; and therefore they could die in the feeling of happiness and joy. Hence our Lord says to the Jews: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day: and he saw it and was glad."

In view of what has been said thus far, we proceed now to determine the import of the ordinance of circumcision as the token of the covenant. It was, in the first place, a *prophecy*

and *pledge* of the future birth of the spotless seed. Upon His coming depended all the blessings of the covenant. Hence the sign of the covenant must first of all be a divine pledge or guarantee of His coming and an assurance for faith in His coming. His coming is not in the way of nature. As Sarah in her old age, "when it had ceased to be with her after the manner of women," could not, without a miraculous interposition of God, conceive and bear a son, so Judaism could not of itself produce a spotless seed, a sinless man, who might be able to deliver and save others. The appearance of the Messiah is not simply an *event* in the history of Judaism, that is, a product merely, under the general concurrence of divine providence, of the life at work previously in the history of Judaism; as Socrates, for example, was the product of the previous life of the Greek nationality. The appearance of the Messiah is an *advent* also. The God-man is infinitely more than the product simply of historical development in the ordinary sense. He is the beginning of a new creation. "The second man," says St. Paul, "is the Lord from heaven." And in the Gospel of St. John He Himself asserts continually that He *came into* the world, and that He *came down from heaven.* His coming, indeed, is by a real conception and birth. To deny this would be Gnosticism; while, on the contrary, to deny His coming from heaven, and to suppose Him to have been the product simply of the life of the Jewish nationality, would be Ebionism. His coming was through Judaism, and yet at the same time from heaven also. Now circumcision, as the token of the covenant, was on the one hand a prophecy or *type* of His birth, the idea in process of realization in this way giving intimation of its presence and making itself felt as a living fact; and on the other hand it was a divine pledge or guarantee of the future absolute realization of the idea, or of the fulfillment of the central promise of the covenant—the *advent* of the Messiah.

But while circumcision was thus in the first place, a type and pledge of the regeneration of *humanity* in and through the incarnation, it was in the second place also a type and pledge of

the regeneration of the individual members of humanity, and especially of the covenant people. It pointed to a new birth, a new life, a new moral creation in the hearts of men. Baptism, which has now, according to Col. ii. 11, 12, taken the place of circumcision, is the Sacrament of regeneration—being ordained for the communication of such great grace, as deliverance from the power of the devil, the remission of sin and the gift of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost. It is not simply a *sign* of such grace, either as received *already*, or *to be* received in the future. The sign and the thing signified are so united that the former is at once a *seal* also of the latter. Where the one is, therefore, the other must be also. But regeneration consists in the implantation of the divine-human life of Christ in the human heart by the Holy Ghost. It follows, therefore, that there could have been no regeneration in the proper sense previously to the incarnation, wherefore also the Old Testament never uses the word. Hence the grace communicated in circumcision was not regeneration. Circumcision was a prefiguration and pledge only of regeneration in the future. But are we to conclude now that it wrought no immediate moral change at all in the hearts of the covenant people? It secured important moral and religious privileges and blessings as well as obligations. Must we not, therefore, conclude that it secured also a corresponding subjective state or disposition in the hearts of those who were the recipients of such privileges and blessings? That it was designed to produce an inward moral change, is evident from the fact that a circumcision of the heart is spoken of as well as a circumcision of the flesh. So, for example, it is said, Deut. xxx. 6, "The Lord will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Not, of course, that there were to be two kinds of circumcision, as men sometimes speak of two kinds of baptism, one *spirit*-baptism and the other *water*-baptism. Men might receive the grace of circumcision in vain, as many now also receive the grace of baptism in vain, when through their own *wilful* neglect this grace remains inoperative; but from this

we have certainly no right to infer that in any case no grace is bestowed. The passage just quoted contains, in fact, an assurance that the circumcision of the heart shall not be wanting where there is the circumcision of the flesh, as the outward sign of the covenant. And that this circumcision of the heart implies a moral change, is evident from the fact that, in consequence of it, the Israelites shall be able to love the Lord their God with all the heart and with all the soul. By nature men are prone to hate God; and wherever there is an ability to love God with all the heart and soul there must be more than mere nature. We may not call this a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost in the Christian sense; but something akin to a new life, a new disposition and tendency of the heart, it certainly is. Hence also the giving of a name was connected with circumcision, as now with baptism. The patriarch's name is changed from *Abram* to *Abraham* at his circumcision. John the Baptist received his name when he was circumcised, as we learn from Luke i. 59-63. This was the universal custom. And the new name given in circumcision was no doubt regarded as an expression of the new life or new heart given at the same time by the Lord.

But what now is the meaning of the circumcision of Christ Himself? Evidently the ordinance could not have had in all regards, the same meaning for the holy child Jesus, that it had for every other son of Abraham. Circumcision, like baptism, its corresponding ordinance in the Christian Church, was essentially an ordinance for sinners. It was, in the measure of the Old Testament, *a saving ordinance.* But where there is no sin, there is no need of salvation, and consequently no need of saving ordinances. But *Jesus was no sinner.* There was in Him no taint of hereditary sin. He was not, like others, conceived and born in sin. The eternal Son of God, indeed, took upon Himself the true nature of man, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Ghost; and, unless the dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary be true, that flesh and blood which He took of her, must have been maculate, stained or disordered by sin. But He, in taking,

it, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, cleansed and purified it; so that from the first moment of His existence in the Virgin's womb, He was immaculate or spotlessly pure. Thus the Son is without taint of sin, though the mother is not. And we may remark by the way that we see here, how not only the death of Christ, but the incarnation itself also is a factor of the atonement. So also the case is viewed in our Catechism; though the Catechism is sometimes misrepresented as holding another theory, and making no account of any thing but the death of Christ, even regarded as something separate from His person. But in the Catechism, after the explanation of the article of the Creed, "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary," the question is asked: "What *benefit* dost thou receive from the *holy conception* and *birth* of Christ?" And the answer returned is: "That He is our Mediator, and with His innocence and perfect holiness covers, in the sight of God, my sin wherein I was conceived." That shows where the Catechism stands. Jesus, therefore, being without sin, needed no salvation, no forgiveness of sin, no regeneration, no change of heart, no conversion. Between Him and the Father there was no estrangement. There was no tendency or disposition in Him to hate God or disobey His will, such as there is in all other men, who therefore need a circumcision of the heart. And if He was nevertheless circumcised, it is clear that this was not done because He had any need of this saving ordinance for Himself. It has, therefore been said that Jesus submitted to this and other ordinances of Judaism, in order to give men an example how they ought to submit to the ordinances of God in His Church. If the sinless One honored the institutions of God, how much more ought sinners to do so! Now, that His conduct in this regard may be viewed as an example which ought to be imitated by others, is of course perfectly true. We may say this of the whole of His life and of all His acts. He has furnished a perfect example of obedience to parental authority, of uprightness and honest dealing with others, of self-sacrificing charity and of patient endurance of suffering. In all these respects men ought to follow His ex-

ample. And so, of course, they ought to follow His example also in honoring the ordinances and institutions of the Church. He was circumcised on the eighth day, and presented in the temple on the fortieth day with the sacrifices commanded by Moses. When He was twelve years old He became a son of the law, and was present among the worshipers in Jerusalem at the celebration of the passover, as He was no doubt every year thereafter. And during His public ministry He diligently observed all the ordinances and institutions of the law. When, for example, He had cleansed the lepers, He sent them to the priests, and commanded them to offer the sacrifices prescribed by Moses. In this way He has certainly given men an example of the manner in which they ought to observe the ordinances of His Church. But after all, we cannot be satisfied with the supposition that this was the primary design of His submission to the ordinances and institutions of the law. His circumcision on the eighth day, whereby He became a member of the theocracy and was formally incorporated with the covenant people, ought certainly to teach Christian parents to consecrate their infants to the Lord in holy baptism; but we cannot think that its primary design was simply to furnish an example in this regard.

Neither would it be correct to say that there was no design or meaning at all in the ordinance as administered to Him. Circumcision, it might be said, was an ordinance of the Jewish religion, involving important blessings and privileges for sinners, and securing for them gifts and graces which by nature they could not have; and Jesus being born of a Jewish mother in a Jewish family, the ordinance was administered to Him as a matter of course, according to custom, though in His case, as He was free from sin, it must have been wholly without meaning. It would then be an evidence of the reality of His human nature, and an important argument against Docetism, but nothing more. If His humanity was to be real, He must necessarily appear in the midst of definite historical relations and circumstances. He could not be man without belonging to some particular race, nationality, family, and without conform-

ing to the civil and religious manners and customs of the people among whom He appeared. Though, in order to be the Saviour of all men of all nations and races, He must be free from all national one-sidedness and defect, as we can easily see that He was, from the portrait which we have of His character in the Gospel; yet, in order that His humanity might be true and real, and not a mere phantom or appearance, it must be truly historical also, belonging to some particular historical people, and bearing the impress of the character and life of that people. It belongs to the genuineness and truth of His human nature, therefore, that He was born in Judaism, of a Jewish mother, of the seed of David, and that He was circumcised on the eighth day, like other Jewish children, and brought up in conformity with the institutions and customs of Judaism.

And yet we can easily see that, unless we assume in these factors of the historical development and life of Jesus some real significance for Himself, they cannot themselves be vindicated from the appearance of Docetism. As it was not accidental that He was born in Judea, of a Jewish mother, in the age of Augustus Cæsar, so neither was it accidental that He was brought up and lived in conformity with the religious and civil customs and habits of Judaism. His circumcision, in particular, was not a merely accidental, unmeaning ceremony, resulting simply from the fact of His Jewish origin according to the flesh. While we may grant, therefore, that it has the force of an example for others, and that it is an evidence of the reality of His human nature, we are bound to assume nevertheless that there is in it a deeper reason or meaning also. By circumcision He became a member of the theocracy, and was incorporated with the covenant people; and that must certainly have had some meaning for Himself, and some bearing upon His subsequent life. The covenant and theocracy, with their legal requirements and bloody ceremonies, were established because of sin and for sinners. Jesus, however, was no sinner, but was destined to be the Saviour of sinners. Hence, He was made "in the likeness of sinful flesh," which made it necessary

for Him to suffer all the consequences of sin, though He was Himself free from its guilt. He was made under the law. "When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. iv. 4, 5. Evidently His being made of a woman, and His being made under the law, are not identical conceptions, else the Apostle's language here would be tautological. The latter must be something superadded to the former, and must have succeeded that, if not in time, at least in the order of sequence, which would, however, itself have required also some expression in time. And the term *law* here we must no doubt take in its widest sense, both as ethical and as ceremonial, both as to its requirements and as to its curse. Jesus was made under the law, so as to fulfill its requirements and to endure and exhaust its curse, and thus to redeem them that were under the law. And when did He formally enter into this relation to the law? We answer: not at His conception, nor at His nativity, but at His circumcision. So Van Osterzee: "He who was ἐκ γυναικὸς γενόμενος, came also at the appointed time ὑπὸ νόμον by *circumcision*. His reception of this rite is an incident in the history of the self-humiliation of Him who, being in the form (μορφῇ) of God, took upon Him the form of a servant. By it He became symbolically bound to perform that will of the Father, for whose fulfilment He had come into the world." Commentary on Luke ii. 21.

It is still an unsettled question whether the incarnation was conditioned solely by sin, and had for its end only the removal of sin; or whether it would not have taken place also if sin had never entered the world. Did not the absolute revelation of God, and the full glorification of man in the kingdom of God, require a union of God and man in this form independently of sin? It would seem, however, that consistent Christological thinking must at last come to an affirmative conclusion in regard to this question. At any rate this is the view of such good theologians as Dorner, Liebner, Shœberlein, Ebrard and many others. The incarnation, according to the whole tenor of

Scripture, is not simply an after thought on the part of God, formed only after the entrance of sin into the world. On the contrary it is clearly involved in God's eternal idea and decree of the creation of the world and of man; for, to quote but one passage, God is said to have "chosen us *in Him* (Christ) before the foundation of the world," consequently in eternity, Eph. i. 4, God eternally willed the incarnation; and if we would suppose this nevertheless to be dependent only on the fact of sin, we must assume that He also eternally willed sin—an assumption that would make sin a necessity and God the author of it, and which must, therefore, ever be abhorrent to the Christian consciousness. Some minds may be so constituted as to be able to embrace it, but the consciousness of the Church must ever protest against it.

Assuming, then, that the incarnation is not conditioned solely by the existence of sin—that Christ is not simply a *means* for the salvation of others, but an *end* also, or absolute *good* in Himself, it follows that His conception and birth simply as such would not have made Him subject to the law, to the curse, to suffering and death; nor would it *necessarily* have made Him to be a *Saviour*, for it would have taken place also if there had been no sin, and consequently no need of a Saviour. By this we do not mean, of course, that His incarnation and the constitution of His person have nothing to do with the salvation of men, and that this is grounded simply in His work, or in His active and passive obedience. His work derives its value only from His person; and the faith by which we are justified, is not faith simply in His work, but faith in His person. But what we do mean is, that we must distinguish between His person as such, and His office as Redeemer. The office is conditioned by the presence of sin. It does not flow with *necessity* from His person. Without His person, of course, the office would have been impossible. But His person might have existed as the absolute revelation of God in man, without the office of Redeemer. The soteric office is something superadded to His person, as that would have been if there had been no sin. The presence of sin, of course, determined

the conditions and circumstances of His historical appearance. It determined the process of His development in the Virgin's womb; for the Logos there, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, eliminated and separated sin from that nature which He assumed into union with Himself. Hence, as we have already said, the incarnation, by which the person of the sinless Mediator was constituted or formed, is a primary factor of the process of the atonement. But the completion of the atonement required that the sinless Mediator should offer His life as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world; or that the Captain of our salvation should be made perfect through suffering. The existence of sin then necessarily conditioned the whole course of His life subsequent to His birth; for His life stood throughout in conflict with sin, from which conflict He came forth triumphantly when He rose again from the dead and brought life and immortality to light. Sin being once present in the world, the Mediator could not appear otherwise than as Redeemer or Saviour. But as the office of Saviour is not *necessarily* connected with His person, or with His coming into the world, there must have been a moment in His time-state when that office, for the execution of which he had, indeed, *now* in view of the existence of sin, come into the world, was *formally* laid upon Him by means of a symbolical transaction,—a moment when He was formally "made under the law," and consecrated to be the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." And that moment was His circumcision, when He became a "debtor to the whole law," and when also the first drops of His precious blood were shed for the sins of the world. Then the curse of that law, which had been given because of sin, was laid upon Him, not because He was Himself a sinner, but because He stood in organic connection with a sinful race, whose members it was His mission to save from sin. For God "made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." 2 Cor. v. 21.

That this is the true meaning of His circumcision is manifest also from the *name* which He then received. "And when

eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, His name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel before He was conceived in the womb." He was born, indeed, for that name, and for the office and work which it implied; but now only is the name formally given to Him. He is now formally devoted and consecrated to be the Saviour of men. For *Jesus* means *Saviour*. Others, indeed, had borne that name before Him. Jesus is the Greek form of the Hebrew name *Joshua*, which means *Jehovah helps* or *Jehovah saves*. But in Jesus of Nazareth alone do the person and character correspond entirely to the name. Joshua the son of Nun brought Israel into the land of promise, the earthly Canaan, and gave them temporary rest from their enemies. But of this One it is said: "He shall save His people from their sins." And St. Peter says: "There is none other *name* under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved;" meaning, of course, not the name as a mere sound, in which sense some occasionally play with it, but the person who bears the name and the character which it implies. Joshua and others were but types of Jesus, representing in a faint way parts only of the idea which is fully realized in Him. Joshua gave the people rest; however it was not the true rest, but only a type or shadow of it. Hence it is said, "There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God." And into this true and eternal rest Jesus of Nazareth only brings those who believe on His name. And His circumcision on the eighth day was His formal investiture with the office expressed in His name. It was the actual commencement, in the way of passive obedience, of that office, through the carrying out of which to the end, now also the ancient covenant, whose sign and seal was circumcision, has been fulfilled, and all that it typified and foreshadowed has become real. Hence the circumcision itself is an important factor, along with the Baptism, suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus, in the process of the atonement. It is not an empty, accidental ceremony, but an important moment in the life of Him "through whom we have obtained the atonement." This thought the Church has expressed in her

Litany: "By the mystery of Thy holy incarnation; by Thy holy nativity and *circumcision;* by Thy Baptism, fasting and temptation; good Lord deliver us." Not any single moment in the life of Jesus, but He Himself in all the moments of His life, is the ground of the atonement.

Jesus, being the fulfillment or substance of the ancient legal covenant, has become the Mediator of a "new and better covenant," in which there are no more types and shadows only of good things to come, and no more bloody rites and sacrifices, in themselves unable to take away sin, which must, therefore, daily be repeated. "For by one offering He has perfected forever them that are sanctified." "And we are *complete* in Him, which is the Head of all principality and power; in whom also we are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." We are made partakers of His saving life, and of the benefits of the new covenant established in Him by "being buried with Him in Baptism, wherein also we are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." This is the thought of the Epistle (Col. ii. 8–17) appointed in our Order of Worship for New Year's Day, which has since the sixth century been celebrated as the festival of the circumcision of Christ. The old covenant with its rites and ceremonies has been abolished; not in the way of annihilation, however, but in such way that its substance has been preserved and elevated into a new and better form. The sign and seal of it now is Holy Baptism, "the circumcision of Christ," the actual sacrament of regeneration, whose inward spiritual grace is "the true circumcision of the heart, whereby being inwardly purged from all worldly and carnal lusts we may offer ourselves unto God a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable through Jesus Christ."

ART. VII.—THE ELEMENTS AND PURPOSES OF THE PARABLE.

BY REV. JOHN I. SWANDER, A.M., LATROBE, PA.

THE universe is full of similarities. There is of necessity an ordained resemblance between the inward forces, as well as the outward forms in God's creation. Truth echoes to truth under some other image. "Coming events cast their shadows before," but different orders of being cast *their* shadows beneath. Each lower stratum of Creation looks up to where "that which is more perfect is come." The mineral kingdom carries forward the solution of its own problem in the vegetable world. The vegetable kingdom gathers up the elements beneath it, and, seeking those things which are above, rises toward the higher form of organic existence within the sphere of the animal. The animal looks up to the human, which is more "fearfully and wonderfully made." Thus this sublime gradation reaches its common consummation in man. Here ends the process of finite perfection. Here rests the crown of finite dominion. And, here, while pausing and poising upon the apex of God's terrestrial handiwork, the Christian philosopher may look around him, and, with the admiration of intelligent faith and piety, behold the kingdom of nature as a shadow of the kingdom of grace; earth as a reflection of heaven; time as an image of eternity; and man, though made a little lower than the angels, crowned with "glory and honor," "in the image of Him who created him."

This resemblance between different orders of existence holds in the very constitution of things as they stand in the organic unity of Infinite design. Under this view resemblance is rather a *fitness* of things. God's works are manifold, and in wisdom He hath made them all, but no piece of His workmanship liveth or dieth unto itself; neither hath it a cycle of

significance in itself. "All for each, and each for all," and the whole for Him who is "all in all," is the musical motto and mission of Jehovah's works. This is possible only upon the basis of organic oneness. Otherwise the whole Creation, if indeed it could have any existence at all, would be a Babylon of confusion worse confounded. Such organic unity implies constituent organic parts. These parts have distinction without separation, and resemblance without identity. This resemblance is not produced by the imagination of man, but by the ordination of God. It is real.

And nowhere is it more real than between the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace—the fallen world and the world of powers at hand for its restoration. The points of analogy between the supernatural sphere of spiritual realities and the natural current of human history are full of instruction for the disciples of faith. The latter is the mirror, in which, when our eye is single, we may behold the superior excellency and surpassing beauty of the former, until our whole ransomed being is full of light. Not that we, according to the woful watchword of modern infidelity, can "look through nature up to nature's God;" but, occupying the place of disciples in the Nazarenean school of philosophy, we may look through nature up to supernatural truth, when God through the mediation of supernatural grace looks down upon us—nay, when He *comes down to us*. This relation of things—this ordained fitness in the entities and activities of the world makes room for the possibility and lays the foundation for the parable.

The proper parable casts its shadows before. These shadows reflected through the glimmerings of previous ages. As a New Testament vehicle of Divine truth it must needs pass through a formative process and disciplinary school to perfection. Tropes and metaphors abounded in the refined literature of Greece and in the rude rhetoric of the Barbarians. The Jewish grammarians used the potential mode and imperfect sense of the parable. This they did in a glass darkly. The

form of expression employed by Jotham in Mount Gerizim, though incorporating the innocent elementary principles of the fable, involved nevertheless, a parabolic incipiency. Nathan's allegory of the ewe-lamb, in which he conveyed the solemn message that made David his own judge, was not entirely different from the parable. The poetic imagery of Isaiah's vineyard; Ezekiel's vision of dry bones; the same prophet's riddle of soaring eagles and withering vine; Solomon's pillars in the house of Wisdom, and others of like character, were favorite figures of speech among the inspired teachers and representative men in the Old Testament era of God's kingdom. These modes of teaching, however, could never make the comers thereunto perfect in the knowledge of saving truth. They are related to the parables of Christ only as shadows of "better things to come." None but Jesus could say of Himself fontally: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

The New Testament parable is an illustrated narrative of sacred truth, holding in the supernatural history of the kingdom of God. As such it is specifically different from the allegory, the fable and the proverb. It does not come under a common category with those figures of speech that live and move and have their being and object of existence within the sphere of fallen nature. It is an apple of gold in a picture of silver for the very purpose of restoring the picture to a *fac simile* of its original by refining the silver from the dross of depravity.

The parable aims to enforce the moral lessons of the Christian allegory, but rejects all arbitrary sentimentalism, silly sensationalism and poetic extravagance. As the humble helpmeet of truth it never flies upon the feeble wings of empty imagination; neither does it fall so far below its native dignity as to suffer its shoes to be untied with the fiction of the fable. While the proverb is a current, comprehensive expression of much in little, the parable is a grand and glorious exhibition of better in good—the supernatural in the natural. Hence we have the elements of the parabolic *Beau ideal* only in Him

who is both the "*Truth*" and the "Teacher come from God." Therefore it was required, both by the nature of His person and His mission, as well as the prophecy going before, that He should open His mouth in parables and speak as mere man never spake.

Jesus Christ, the God-man, is He in whom there is not only a gathering together of all things, "both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in Him" (Eph. i. 10); but He is also the original Archetype of all essential institutions and activities in the covenant and history of human redemption. "As is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." "The last Adam was made a quickening spirit," to quicken—not in a spiritualistic, abstract and arbitrary way, the dry bones of the prophet's vision, but through the organic onflow of His own Divine-human life in the grace-communicating functions of His mystical body. The mighty mystery of God manifest in the flesh as a revelation of the supernatural *in* and *through* the natural brings with it of necessity a plastic power that predetermines the nature and moulds the character of all the ordinances and agencies within the compass of mediatorial activities. Quality and quantity are determined by the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." Less would be insufficient; more would be unnecessary and else would be extraneous. There is neither room, necessity nor admissibility for the mechanical within the periphery of the organic.

The proper force and solemn significance of the means of grace throughout flow from their organic relation to Christ. The theanthropic life of "Him in whom all things consist" governs the nature of the Sacraments and ordains the constituent elements of their being. They are what they are because Christ is what He is. Since Christ is not a mere outward sign, the Sacraments "have to do, not with outward signs only, but with the heavenly realities themselves." Under this view it is both in reason and faith that they are held as channels for the communication of such great grace. Ordained according to the most logical accuracy of Infinite Wisdom, and responsive to the concrete necessities of the case, the law of the Spirit of

life in Christ Jesus keeps them free from the law of empty signs and outward ceremonies. Why, then, do the heathen rage, and why are the people taught to imagine a vain thing? "Wherefore do they spend their money for that which is not bread? and labor for that which satisfieth not?" We have seen ministers *labor* for forty-five minutes to prove the emptiness of the Holy Communion, and then descend with a self-sufficient air of sanctimonious triumph from the "stand" to "distribute" the twelve baskets of fragments to a famishing flock. How sad to witness such an "exercise." It is not lawful, in this way, to cast the children's bread unto the dogs, and leave the family to starve into spiritual dwarfs upon the meager diet of sentimental subjectivity. How humiliating to the proper pride of piety to see the earnest efforts of this age galvanizing a shadow. This is done with "a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge." Oh when shall we realize the golden dream of that more sure word of prophecy?

What is claimed for the Sacraments under this view is equally predicable of the holy ministry. It is an embassy of supernatural powers in natural human persons. So also in the constituent elements of the written Word. Holy *men* spake and wrote as they were moved by the *Holy Ghost*, but yet in such a way that seemed good both to the Holy Ghost and to them. A proper account of identity in the respective factors of each distinct mystery in God's kingdom is the preservative not only against the Eutychianism of the past, but also the various onesidedisms of the present. The revealed Word is incarnate in the Scripture *because* the Eternal Word is incarnate in Jesus Christ. "*Go ye*, THEREFORE," is written in the credentials of every agency that Jesus Christ has commissioned. All other views of such agencies belong to that other gospel which is the logical deduction and legitimate offspring of a false Christology. Nestorianism is the poisonous yet popular heresy of this country. What God has joined together, men make merit of putting asunder. This they do in the cunning craftiness of carnal sagacity. Unsacramental piety, because it is ignorant of the righteousness of God, goeth about to

establish its own righteousness. This denial of the proper powers of the world to come is conceived by the unholy spirit of anti-Christ, and leads of necessity to a spiritualistic or humanitarian church, a distortive view of the Holy Scripture, and mere negative theories of ecclesiastical tradition. When such views are entertained of the *cardinal points* of the compass, there is no room for logical churchliness at any point. The parable is a mere metonomy; ordination a silly ceremonial "touch of priestly hands;" and the efficient minister a man of "moral aptitudes." Amidst such dreadful perversion and poverty it makes but little difference, indeed, whether the popular preacher of Plymouth pulpit and others of like precious fancy have been ordained by their mothers (as they assert) or by somebody else. In fact, the kingdom of heaven would suffer less violence if such men had never been ordained at all.

For the world in its estrangement from God, the kingdom of Christ is parabolic. "To them that are without *all* these things are done in a parable." To those who are self-wise in their ignorance of first principles, the Great Teacher propounds the question: "How then can ye understand all parables?" Starting in the great mystery of the Word made flesh, aiming at the full and final revelation of God *in* man and God *to* man, the coming kingdom is of necessity a constant coming from behind the veil—a continual looking of the supernatural through the ever-increasing transparency of the natural, until the natural in return, fully illumined with the "light of life," shall be permitted to "see as it is seen," and able, not only to apprehend even as it is apprehended, but also to comprehend the full "fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God" (Eph. iii. 9).

In Jesus Christ the divine and the human centre in *personality*. He is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. In the Holy Catholic Church the divine and human, through the personal agency of the Holy Ghost, flow from Christ as the *life* of the world. In the Holy Ministry these elements proceed from the *authority* of Him

who possesses all power, supernatural and natural, as the fruit of His glorious resurrection. In the Holy Sacraments they constitute another sublime mystery, ordained for the communication of such great *grace* as it is fontally in the fullness of Christ. In the Holy Scriptures the divine and human factors of revelation are wedded in the hallowed bonds of inspired *truth* as it is in Jesus. And by the mouth of Him who is the personal truth, revelation in illustration constitute the *parable.* Thus personality, life, authority, grace, truth and parabolic utterance, in the respective forms of their manifestations, complement each other in the logical and chronological order of the great mystery of godliness.

In each of these distinct parabolic mysteries of mediation the Holy Spirit is the bond of union. The supernatural is conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin natural. The angel of annunciation proclaims a message to all the blushing hand-maids of the Lord in the sacramental family of the Jerusalem which is above. "The power of the Highest" "overshadows" the receptivity of the lower factor, giving birth not only to the Son of God, but also to each consequent "holy thing" in the order of parabolic mysteries. The same Eternal Spirit, who in the old creation moved upon the face of the chaotic deep to bring order out of confusion and light out of darkness, now moves in the deep mysteries of the new creation, causing the powers of "the world to come" to penetrate the helpless confusion of the fallen world, and making it possible for the light to shine in darkness, though the darkness may comprehend it not.

This new creation holds in the bosom of the Church. Here is the Holy Spirit's home. The abnormal order of nature may be "overshadowed" with the prevenient power of the "Highest," but the world which "lieth in sin" cannot receive the Spirit of truth, as an indwelling principle, "because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him." The Holy Ghost lights the lamp of revelation, and continues to supply the oil because the lamp is in the hand of the bride. Its light would soon go out in the hand of Philistia's uncircumcised daughter. Its native

brilliancy even wanes whether in the papal or puritanic hands of Israel's foolish virgins. The virtue of the Bible is relative. The Holy Scriptures are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," only when taken in their concrete historical relations to all organic antecedents and consequents in the mystical body of Christ. With the Psalmist's saints and sinners, the Scriptures were born in Zion. Here the Holy Spirit penetrates their solemn contents and radiates their sacred page, causing them to serve the purpose for which the revealed word has become incarnate in the volume of inspiration. What is that purpose? To bear the truth unto those to whom "it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven."

What has just been said of the Holy Bible, may be affirmed, with more emphatic stress, of the parable proper. Christ is the truth. Truth has a revelation. Revelation has a history, or process of development. History has a culminating point. The culminating point of historical revelation, under one view, is the parable. The parable is therefore not essentially different from the contents of the Scriptures in their entirety. It does not differ in the *matter*, but in the *mode* of revelation. It is the latest edition of the same Book with various illustrations; the divinely ordained method of *object-teaching* in the college curriculum of Christ. The order of revelation "is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." The parable in revelation may be regarded as the full corn in the ear.

This gradual progress in God's method of revealing the truth to man was called for by the undisciplined condition of the world. It has ever been uttered and echoed along the line of untutored ages; "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Merciful wisdom ordained the order of first seeing through a glass darkly. The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, but never does violence to the kingdom of nature. Fallen humanity is so constituted that a sudden flooding of the world with light would be no better than a perpetual

night of dismal darkness. This is true, already of man's physical nature. Wherefore God hath set a tabernacle for the sun, whose going forth is from the *end* of the heaven where, coming out of his chamber, he first casts his reflected rays. Then

> "With tender flush, and mellow stain,
> Salutes the world with life and light."

Thence, rising from his "chamber," through the "circuit" of the heaven he pours full lustre from the throne of his meridian glory, until "there is nothing hid from the heat thereof." So with man's moral nature. It requires the same preparatory treatment. If he shuts his eyes against the dawn of the morning in God's day of revelation, he will be unprepared to apprehend the lessons, and admire the glory of its noon.

This was the fundamental error of the Jews. History with them was but the collection of fragmentary facts. The *historical* argument was foreign to their logic of abstract legalism. Romanism and Rationalism are both stumbling upon the same rock of offence. The Jews supposed that the kingdom of God was *at hand* while it was only in the act of *coming*. And when their eyes were blinded by the dust of their city, wiped from the unwelcome feet of the rejected Evangelists, the kingdom of God came nigh unto them as a judgment. Thus, flying from one extreme to another, they have been groping their way for eighteen centuries, looking with carnal expectations for the coming kingdom, when, in fact, *it is at hand* with power and great glory. The Christ of history was not for them the Christ of prophecy, because they had no properly historical interpretation of the prophetic era. They closed and clasped the volume of revelation before its most important chapters were written, and consequently had their part taken away out of the book of life, and out of the holy city. Refusing to eat of the typical *leaves* of the tree of life which were designed for the healing of the nation, they were not prepared to relish the parabolic *fruits* which grow upon the Tree of Life in the New Jerusalem.

Here we are now most naturally led to inquire after the *design* of our Lord in the use of the parable. According to the prevailing modern view He had recourse to this mode of uttering the truth for the exclusive purpose of making it more plain and practical for the masses. This view, however, is one-sided. His purpose was more solemn and comprehensive than such a theory implies. His parabolic word is a two-edged sword. It was the design of the great Teacher, not only to make the truth plain to the children of light through the transparency of such symbolic form, but also, in the same act, to commission the angel of judgment to those whose hearts had waxed gross and whose ears were dull of hearing. Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away, even that he hath. This Scriptural rule is as general as it is constitutional. It holds with equal force both in the dispensations of God's providence and mysteries of His grace. This view leaves no room for those mechanical and arbitrary theories of Election which ignore the proper sphere and powers of man, making the responsible endowment of human freedom, but a floating feather upon the supralapsarian current of the Divine will.

Jesus Christ the greatest gift of God is a rock of offence and a stone of stumbling to the disobedient, while He is precious to them that believe. The holy ministry, the preached Word, the sacraments, all are blessings or judgments unto men according as they possess or lack the power of spiritual discernment. The same is most emphatically true of the parables. Like Israel's pillar of fire, they have a cloudy side for those who love darkness rather than light, as well as a bright side for those who love light rather than darkness. It savors not of fatalism to say that God has wisely and justly arranged it in the very constitution of things that those who *will* not see *shall* not see. The mines of wealth preserve the precious metals both *for* the rewards of industrious labor, and *from* the polluting grasp of sluggish indolence. Science bewilders the untutored barbarian, but reveals the marvelous majesty of nature's wonderful works to the well disciplined and inquiring mind of the scientific stu-

dent. This order of things holds with greater force in the supernatural domain of Christ's kingdom, where things are spiritually discerned. The law is good, if a man use it lawfully, but the way of the transgressor is hard. The Gospel is a stumbling-block to the Jew, foolishness to the Greek, but the power of God unto the believer's salvation. The same is eminently true of the parable. Our Saviour's interpretation of its purpose cannot be gainsaid. It leaves no room for cavil. When the disciples asked the question: "Why speakest thou unto them in parables?" The Lord said unto them; "Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." Why? "Because seeing, they see not; and hearing, they hear not; neither do they understand; and their eyes have *they* closed." But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear.

The parable is intelligible only to *faith*. It speaks in an unknown tongue to the fallen faculties of the unregenerated mind. So much is true of supernatural revelation in any form. Reason cannot transcend the limits of its own helplessness. Its wings are too impotent for such a lofty flight. Even the "princes of this world" are unable to know the "wisdom of God in a mystery"—the truth as it is in Jesus. Christ said My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent Me. If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine. This is both the will and work of God that ye believe on Him whom God hath sent—*Faith* in full emphatic positiveness, and essentially comprehensive! The mere negative moonshine of fanciful assent to some colossal stride of scriptural wonder is but the mimicry and mockery of faith. The dynamic power of God's kingdom begets and necessitates a faith that knows rather than a knowledge that believes. Such faith can look through the transparent vail of the natural and behold the transporting mystery of the supernatural in the person of *the Christ* and the Holy Catholic Church. Its possibility is predicable of the fact that the supernatural Son of the living God has looked and is still looking through the vail, and, by the preaching of the Gospel, calls to the Nathaniels of a ruined race to come from the cursed

and withering fig-tree of fallen humanity to the Tree of Life which is in the midst of the paradise of God. Here, faith is not only a "hearty trust," but the very *evidence* of things not seen in the dubious darkness of perverted reason, and the very *substance* of things that can not be hoped for in the fallen constitution of the world. Happy is the soul in possession of this Jewel of inestimable worth! Unto such it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom so far as essential unto salvation. Pending the revelation of other mysteries patience has her perfect work in waiting for the advent of absolute perfection.

This faith has its being in the family of the faithful. Both its Alpha and Omega are encompassed in the covenant. To understand any parabolic truth, man must be in the element of the truth, as well as have the elements of the truth in him. Christ is full of grace and truth, (John i. 14). The Church is His fullness (Eph. i. 23) as well as the ground and pillar of the truth. We must therefore be in the Church before we can be in the element of truth unto salvation. More. Faith must and does apprehend the Holy Catholic Church in the sense of the Creed. Those who fail to apprehend the Church in this sense, as the veritable mystery of godliness, may, indeed, walk about Zion, tell her towers, consider her palaces and mark her bulwarks bristling with the defensive bayonets of truth, but cannot enter the "Holiest of all" and behold the ravishing glory of the New Testament Shechinah as unveiled in the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched. (Heb. viii. 2). Amidst the disconsolate negations and desolations of defective faith, how thankful Christian charity is that there is a salvation "as by fire." How terribly sublime will be the conflagration of the "wood," "hay" and "stubble" both of Romish and Rationalistic architecture. From the fate of those who neither apprehend, nor are apprehended, Good Lord deliver us. Out of the Church, the parabolic pillar of fire is either a pillar of dark cloud only, or a portentous prophecy of fiery indignation felt in the fearful forebodings of a "judgment to come." How great the darkness of the human soul when the natural light within it reflects its deep and dreadful intensity. "Unto them that

are without, all these things are done in parables, that seeing, they may see and not perceive." (Mark iv. 11). Distance, here lends no enchantment to the view, except that of deep delusion. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit. "God makes known His ways unto Moses and His acts unto the *children of Israel.*" "Unto *them* is committed the oracles of God." Others have neither right to consult nor power to understand their teachings. Blessed are they who are not only called to the marriage supper of the Lamb, but whose feast of faith in Christ is not without its corresponding and complementing faith in the "Bride" and "Lamb's wife." For such there is a veritable communion of saints. They are the legitimate children of the bride-chamber, and have legitimate claims to that inheritance whose principle is life, whose purity is immaculate and whose beauty fadeth not away. No wonder that they hear the Bridegroom's voice and rejoice in the prospect of His coming. Having been planted in the house of the Lord, they may reasonably hope to flourish in the courts of our God. In this blessed communion of saints, faith has Christ for its ground, Revelation for its guide, and Heaven for its goal. For such the parable parts the folds and fragments of the temple's vail and points to the panorama of the world to come. How beautiful the scenery thus uncurtained to confront the organ of spiritual vision! How transcendently glorious must be the more magnificent mysteries of the "Most Holy Place."

Art. VIII.—OUR EDUCATIONAL POLICY.*

We do not propose to discuss this subject at length. We wish merely to present some statements that may serve to correct certain misconceptions, and thus aid to bring about a better general understanding in the Church.

It is sometimes given out, that the Eastern Synod has adopted an educational policy, and that this policy defines the character, which our classical schools should assume in relation to the College at Lancaster. This, we think, is a mistake. Synod has never, so far as we know, legislated on this subject. The history of the case, according to our recollection, is this. The only school under the care of a Classis in the Eastern Synod for many years was the Clarion Collegiate Institute. In 1865 the Mercersburg Classis established another, and called it *Mercersburg College*, and obtained a charter for it with this title. The subject of establishing others was then agitated, and Lebanon Classis went forward in starting Palatinate College, and later Philadelphia Classis took under its care, in some form, we believe, Ursinus College. There is nothing in the Constitution of the Church, which prescribes what shall be the character of our literary institutions. It does not refer to them. In regard to Theological Seminaries, it does provide that they shall be under the care of the District Synods, in the bounds of which they are located. We are of the opinion, that no lower body than a Synod, whether a Classis or a Board, has the authority or right to establish or maintain a Theological Seminary to educate young men for the ministry in the Reformed Church. We do not believe, that a Classis or Board have the authority or right to provide in any way to give young men a course in theological study, with the view to prepare them for the ministry, even without the formal appointments of a Seminary. Where this is attempted under the alleged right of individual ministers to prepare young men for the ministry, we believe it is an eva-

**Note.*—Several articles intended for this number, one of which is from the Editor, have been unavoidably crowded out.

sion of one of the plain provisions of the Constitution. We believe further, that, where this is done, the Synod is in duty bound to take measures to prevent any of its ministers from engaging in the work.

But the case is different, it seems to us, in regard to purely literary institutions. In reference to them, the Constitution is silent. The fact remains, it is true, that the Eastern Synod has taken under its care Franklin and Marshall College, agreeing on condition of the transfer, to raise a certain amount for its increased endowment. And from this it might be inferred, that the Synod does not wish any other Reformed College to be established within its territory, and further that it desires all other schools under the care of the Classes to be subsidiary to this College. But this inference loses its force, when we consider, that at the meeting of Synod at Hagerstown a committee was appointed to report on the subject of our educational policy in regard to the College and these schools, and that the committee reported, that they could not agree, and had no policy to recommend. The Synod then took no action in the premises. This shows that Synod has taken no action on the subject, not because the matter was never brought to its notice, but for some other reason. Again, we have the fact, that the Synod at Mechanicsburg directed the Board of Trustees of the Seminary to lease the Seminary property to the Regents of *Mercersburg College* for ninety-nine years, knowing that those regents were carrying on a chartered College, with all the appointments of a College. It seems clear then, that the Synod has adopted or specified no policy in regard to literary institutions under the care of the Classes. Whether it has the constitutional right to do so, whether it would be proper to do so, supposing it has the constitutional right, or whether it is right for a Classis to carry forward a College, in view of the fact that Synod has its own College, are questions which we do not propose to consider now.

The removal of the Theological Seminary to Lancaster certainly shows, that Synod regards Lancaster as the centre of her literary and theological institutions, but to what extent the Classes can labor in maintaining literary institutions consistent-

ly with this arrangement, is still left, we think, to their own discretion.

It is not difficult to see, that the educational policy in Church and State in this country is still unsettled. We are yet working only in the beginnings of our history. In comparing our institutions with those of Prussia, or Germany, for instance, a variety of questions arise. To establish academies of a thorough character, to be feeders for our Colleges, would not bring our system into agreement with theirs. A German Gymnasium is nearly equivalent to an American College. It does not undertake quite so much, leaving out the course in philosophy and science philosophically studied, and as a consequence it does more thoroughly what it undertakes. Our Colleges combine the studies of the Gymnasium and the University in one, and in doing this they unquestionably undertake too much and do too little. We greatly need in this country more thoroughness and drill in the elementary studies. The study of the ancient languages is likely to fall into low repute, not because we have too much in this department, but because we fail to properly master them. One reason of this is, because students are put into philosophical studies before they have mastered their elementary course, and, in carrying forward the latter, find too little time to master the former at the same time. This is most sensibly felt in our Colleges in the Reformed Church, in which the course in philosophy takes larger dimensions than in most American Colleges. For the sake of our rich and full course in philosophy, including now Psychology, Logic, Æsthetics, Ethics, History of Philosophy and Philosophy of History, we could most heartily wish, that the Church would liberally endow one or two professorships at least, to provide for lectures in a post-graduate course. Without this either our elementary drill, or our course in philosophy must be dwarfed. Here lies the beginning of a University, which we yet hope the Church will provide for. To attempt to remedy this defect by merely making our preparatory schools more thorough and honest (a reformation most devoutly to be wished for) would not meet the case unless the College was so changed as to bring into it what

would be equivalent to a post-graduate course. We believe a beginning at the upper end would serve greatly to draw after it the lower, whereas to commence below, with no adequate provision at the conclusion, would fail in accomplishing the desired end.

In considering this subject, we meet also the practical difficulty of the peculiar relation of Church and State in this country. We believe our American position on this subject is in advance of the European. We advocate no union of Church and State such as prevails there. Yet it is clear, that in carrying forward the work of education, as well as in some other matters, we have not yet determined in what way these two, the Church and the State, may mutually labor. The State has its own system, a system which will be found to be beset with new difficulties, as it goes forward to provide for higher education, and more liberal culture. Hitherto this department has been left mainly to the Church; but it is plain, that the State will not rest satisfied, until it has taken hold of this, in some way, itself. Already the question as to the work of the State in maintaining Colleges is agitated. Shall it merely aid the higher Church institutions, or shall it claim the right to determine in part what the character of these shall be? Its own system thus far has been Christless; will it seek to remedy this evil? If not, is it safe for the Church to enter into any alliance with it? The time may come, when the State will yield so far to the claims of the Church, as to agree that it needs her to infuse proper spirit into the education of its citizens, and then the State may aid the Church also in the support of her institutions; but that time has not yet come, and for the present we would advocate energetic work on the part of the Church to organize her own schools from the College down to the parochial school. Better make pecuniary sacrifices than to sacrifice her own children to a godless education.

We have penned these remarks, in order to show, that our educational policy is not yet fixed, and that some are in danger of mistaking their own notions in regard to it for Synodical enactments. It is not wise nor well to impugn the motives of those

who are laboring in the educational work in a way that we may not approve. In our zeal for our Alma Mater, we may conceive some to be unwise and disloyal, who have proved their loyalty to the cause of Christian education and the Church through many years of hard toil. Let us learn to trust each other, and in things doubtful exercise the largest charity. We make no doubt but that our humble efforts in various ways throughout the Church will in due time harmonize. History is more powerful than individuals, and with true hearts and faithful hands, what at times may seem only confusion worse confounded, will prove itself in the end to be the necessary chaos from which will issue order and beauty.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE CONSERVATIVE REFORMATION AND ITS THEOLOGY; As represented in the Augsburg Confession, and in the History and Literature of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By Charles P. Krauth, D.D., Norton Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1871.

This work has been before the public for some time, and we had looked into it somewhat before it came into our hands through the kindness of the author. A notice of it appears in the present number of this Review, by a clergyman of the Lutheran Church. The notice, as it purports, is from the Lutheran stand-point, and is, therefore, flattering in its endorsement of all the positions of the author. It will be understood, of course, that its appearance does not involve, in any way, an endorsement of all its positions by this Review.

Another notice of this book is appearing in the "Reformed Church Messenger," by Dr. J. W. Nevin, from the Reformed stand-point. We feel called upon, therefore, to refer, but briefly and in a general way, to the work at this time.

Dr. Krauth ranks among the leading scholars and theologians of this country. He is unquestionably in possession of the most abundant resources to enable him to present his theme with masterly historical ability. This volume presents the results of years of faithful and persevering study. Though it is made up of separate and independent treatises, yet it easily and naturally falls under the unity of its title, and presents altogether the best statement

and defence of the Lutheran side of the Reformation, that has yet appeared in this country.

So long as both the Lutheran and the Reformed theologies in this country were drifting into the current of Puritanism, there seemed to be no occasion to discuss the differences between them. These differences vanished before the danger that impended of both theologies, and to some extent Churches also, being lost in the unsacramental and unchurchly spirit of the times. Hence the German Reformed Church was prepared to make common cause with the Lutheran Church, even before this latter was awake to the danger, in reviving the general doctrine of sacramental grace. The two stand together as against the rationalistic position of Puritanism on the subject of the Church and the sacraments. Lifted out of this false position into which the theologies of both Churches had, to a large extent, fallen in this country, they can now look each other in the face, as honest men, representing the two sides of the great Protestant Reformation.

Yet it ought not to be forgotten, that we live, not in the sixteenth, but, in the nineteenth century. The Reformed Church has made some progress in theology. The days of the old war between the two confessions have passed away, and the treatment of the general subject of difference between them, must necessarily reveal a progress. Yet it is just here, that, in our view, Dr. Krauth seems to fail. He does not seem willing to make account of this progress of theology on both sides, as the later German theologians, both Lutheran and Reformed, are prepared to do. Indeed, his fundamental position, that the Lutheran was the only true Reformation, and the Reformed only one-sided and radical, disqualifies him, as it appears to us, for doing justice to the Reformed Church.

Yet we do not regret, that the topics he so ably brings before the theological public of America, are made subjects of discussion. They are topics of grave importance, and their study cannot but prove a benefit. To our mind the differences between the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions start from their different views of the person of Christ, or rather they centre there. This brings with it different views of the office of the Holy Spirit in relation to Christ, and then too a difference in the views of the Lord's Supper. But we do not propose to designate the difference on these points in this brief notice. Although strongly denominational, we regard Dr. Krauth's work as a valuable contribution to theological literature, for which he deserves the thanks, not only of his own Church, but even of those which may decidedly differ with him.

THE DIALOGUES OF PLATO, Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions. By B. Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford. In four volumes. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1871.

No one can enter properly into communion with the literature, philosophy, and life, of the ancient heathen world, without some familiarity with Plato. It is only professional scholars, however, who can study the whole of his works in the original. The little taste we get in a college course can do no more than whet the appetite. if an appetite has been created, for the rest of his writings. While translations for the college student had better be eschewed, the ones here presented will be of great service to those, who, prepared to appreciate the writings of this great master of thought, cannot find time to study him extensively in the original.

The work here brought out by the enterprising publishers, Scribner & Company of New York, has the guarantee for its reliability, in the name and position of the author, and the outward appearance is such as to render it an ornament in the library. It comprises all the writings of Plato.

A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek, according to the text of Tischendorf; with a Collation of the Textus Receptus, and of the Texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles. By Frederick Gardener, D. D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School. Author of "A Commentary on the Epistle of St. Jude," "A Harmony of the Gospels in English," etc. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Edinburg: H. T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1871.

This Harmony of the Gospels claims certain distinctive features to recommend it as compared with other Harmonies, of which we note the following:

1. A critical text. "This may already be found in Tischendorf's valuable *Synopsis Evangelica*, but not in combination with the other features, and even this text is not as yet conformed to his latest edition."

2. All distinct quotations from the Old Testament are given in full in the margin according to Tischendorf's edition of the LXX., together with the *var. lect.* of the Alexandrine text, and of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and also of the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, when any of these are matters of interest or importance.

3. A selection of parallel references has been placed in the margin, &c.

4. Brief notes, relating only to matters of harmony.

There are other features to which we cannot refer. Altogether, we have been much pleased with this Harmony, and recommend it to those, whose studies lead them to an examination of the original text of the Gospels.

Americanisms; The English of the New World. By M. Schele De Vere, LL.D., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Virginia. Author of "Studies in English," etc. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1872.

This is a very presentable volume of some 600 pages, giving the peculiarities of the American diction, under twelve different heads. The chapter under the head of the *German*, might have been considerably amplified in proportion to the other chapters. The book is an accession to our linguistic literature, and will prove interesting and entertaining to all who feel interested in studying the growth of the English language in America, or who desire merely to become acquainted with many words peculiar to this country, their derivation, etc.

RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY; or, NATURE, MAN, AND THE BIBLE WITNESSING TO GOD AND TO RELIGIOUS TRUTH, being the substance of four courses of lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute, between the years 1845–1853. By Alonzo Potter, D.D., LL.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1872

The author of these lectures was widely known in this country as a man of lovely spirit, of sound judgment, untiring zeal for the promotion of a sound Christianity. His mind was well stored with knowledge, and he was able to communicate his knowledge to others in a pleasing style.

The book which contains the lectures now referred to, is appropriately styled a religious philosophy. It seeks to employ the light of nature to lead to the greater light of revelation. The general theme of the relation of these two to each other, we need not say, has become one of the great questions of the age in which we live. Dr. Potter seemed to have a kind of foresight as to the importance of this question, and opens it on broad and comprehensive ground. No doubt some of the chapters would have been modified and improved, to suit the new phases of thought and investigation, had the author lived a few years longer. He was engaged in the revision of this and other works at the time of his death, which occurred during a sea voyage he had undertaken for the benefit of his health.

According to a promise made, his son, now President of Union College, in which his father was, at the time these lectures were delivered, Professor of Moral Philosophy, has edited this volume, as a task of filial love. It will no doubt be sought for and read, especially in the large communion over which Bishop Potter presided for *a number of years.*

SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS. By James Anthony Froude, M.A. Late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Second Series. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1871.

The author of this volume has become widely known through his History of England. The great subjects discussed are, Calvinism, A Bishop of the Twelfth Century, Father Newman on "The Grammar of Assent," Condition and Prospects of Protestantism,

England and her Colonies, A Fortnight in Kerry, two parts, Reciprocal Duties of State and Subject, The Merchant and his Wife, On Progress, The Colonies, Education, England's War, the Eastern Question, Scientific Method applied to History. These are interesting subjects, and handled with ability. Froude does not profess to be a theologian, and his papers on subjects of a theological character, are written from the standpoint of the historian. His article on Calvinism is able, but it fails to see that Christianity presents another starting-point than reason, or even the divine decree, viz.: the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. Calvinism is a strong system, as Stoicism was, with which its philosophic adherents always compare it, but it does not present the true central principle for Christianity.

Froude is a Protestant, with somewhat of a partizan spirit. He can see very little good in Romanism on certain topics, though on others he is quite liberal, and sees much of a falling off in Protestantism. His notions of reform, not through the ministry and Church as such, nor theology, but through the laity, and an earnest Christian life, contain truths, but they are one-sided. Altogether these papers furnish very interesting reading.

A History of Philosophy, from Thales to the Present Time. By Dr. Friedrich Ueberweg, late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Königsberg. Translated from the Fourth German Edition. By Geo. S. Morris, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Michigan. With additions by Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College. With a Preface by the Editors of the Philosophical and Theological Library. Vol. 1.—History of the Ancient and Mediæval Philosophy. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1872.

This is the first of a series of works that are being brought out by Henry B. Smith, D.D., and Philip Schaff, D.D., Professors in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. They are to be translations from recent German works, with additions, and are to constitute a Theological and Philosophical Library. They will be welcomed by many students and scholars in this country, who, though somewhat acquainted with the German language, can make much more rapid progress in the study of such works, when translated into their own tongue. Still more will they be welcomed by those, who may not be prepared to study them at all in the German language.

The history of Philosophy is a comparatively new study in this country. Indeed, the study of Philosophy itself is only beginning to take a place in the curriculum of American Colleges. There are exceptions, among which we may class Franklin and Marshall College, at Lancaster, Pa., of which Dr. J. W. Nevin, is President, confessedly one of the first metaphysical scholars of the age. Its course in philosophy, embracing Psychology, Logic, Æsthetics,

Ethics, and the Philosophy of History, is more full and thorough, we believe, than that of American Colleges generally, if not of any one of them. Yet we know also, that there has been great progress in the study of philosophy in this country, during the last twenty years Such works as Christianity and Greek Philosophy, by Dr. Cocker, Intellectual Philosophy by Dr. Porter, besides others that might be named, reveal a high order of philosophical talent.

It is beginning to be felt, that the study of philosophy requires a knowledge of its history. This is brought out, in a marked way, in Dr. Porter's work. But the case requires, that this subject should find its place as an independent study. For this purpose we have been poorly off for text-books in this country. Schwegler's outline is very brief, and somewhat obscure in the translation. Morrell's covers only a portion of the ground. This work of Ueberweg seems to have many advantages over any that we have. It is comprised in two volumes—and the matter is so arranged, that the main outline in large type is comparatively brief, while the sections in small type present a full and elaborate treatment of the topics discussed. It presents the latest results of German study. It is a work that we have been wanting to find, and we have no doubt there are others who will be glad to get it, as well as the succeeding volumes, promised by the Editors, on theology and philosophy. This first volume is octavo, beautifully gotten up, and contains about 480 pages.

INSECTS AT HOME. Being a Popular Account of Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A., F.L.S., &c. Author of "Homes without Hands," "Bible Animals," "Common Objects of the Sea-Shore and Country," etc. With upwards of 700 figures. By E. A. Smith and J. B. Zwecker. Engraved by G. Pearson. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1872.

This is a large volume of between 600 and 700 pages, elegantly bound, and beautifully illustrated with fine engravings. It is a full treatise on Entomology, but prepared in such popular style, as to render it interesting to all. We would commend it as a useful and instructive *family book*. The world of insects is not to be despised. It forms one of the grand divisions of animated nature. Our children ought to be instructed in regard to it, and farmers, horticulturists and others will find it specially interesting. Every bug and beetle, yea, every insect is here described, with its habits, etc. The engravings serve to enable the reader to identify these little creatures.

THE WONDERS OF WATER. From the French of Gaston Tissandier. Edited, with numerous Additions, by Schele De Vere, D.D., LL.D., of the University of Virginia, Author of "Studies in English," "Americanisms," etc. With sixty four illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1872.

Those who have procured the former volumes of the Illustrated Library of Wonders, will be pleased to add this additional volume. It gives information of every kind in regard to this large portion of inorganic nature, and contains useful hints on the hygiene of water, mineral springs, &c., &c. This volume is brought out in still more handsome style than the former volumes. All may read it with profit and pleasure, but especially will the children be delighted with it.

The History of Greece. By Professor Dr. Ernst Curtius. Translated by Adolphus William Ward, M.A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge; Professor of History in Owen's College, Manchester. Revised after the last German edition. By W. A. Packard, Ph. D. Professor of Latin in the College of New Jersey. Vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1871.

This volume embraces Book the Second. From the Dorian Migration to the Persian Wars, and Book the Third, From the Termination of the Ionian Revolt to the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. This work is enriched with German research and learning, and the translation runs as smoothly as though it were written originally in English. It is brought out in uniform style with Mommsen's History of Rome.

Japan in our Day. Compiled and arranged by Bayard Taylor. New York: Charles Scribner & Company, 1872. Pp. 280.

The publishers of this volume, issued in successive volumes, a series of books, entitled "Library of Wonders." They were full of interest, and imparted a great variety of useful information. The series proved very popular, and obtained a wide circulation.

The same publishers have projected another series of volumes, equally cheap, convenient, interesting, and valuable. They are to cover another sphere, affording similar, if not greater room, for special attraction. The new series is to be entitled, "The Library of Travel, Exploration, and Adventure," and "is designed to furnish a clear, picturesque, and tolerably complete survey of our present knowledge of lands and races, as it is supplied by the narratives of travelers and explorers, especially those of our own times." They are to be edited by Bayard Taylor.

The work before us is the initial volume of the series. It furnishes an interesting and attractive history of Japan, as it is known at the present day, compiled from the most recent and most reliable sources. It is largely embellished with handsomely executed illustrations.

A remarkable change of policy has recently taken place in the Japanese government. The empire is now becoming open to the introduction of the arts and ideas of modern civilization. The Japanese themselves are gathering personally, knowledge from

abroad. All this is very naturally followed by a corresponding increase on the part of other nations, in their knowledge of the Japanese institutions and people. The future, with regard to Japan looks, at present, peculiarly hopeful; and all who are interested in the progress of human affairs, will hail with delight, the appearance of a volume like that before us. The compiler's reputation as an author is a sufficient guarantee for its excellence and worth. F.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. A Hand-book for Bible Students. By the Rev. J. J. Van Oosterzee, D D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the Dutch, by Maurice J. Evans, B. A., Translator of Dr. Hoffmann's "Prophecies of Our Lord and His Apostles." New York: Dodd & Mead, Publishers, No. 762 Broadway, 1871. Pp. 446.

The facilities for studying the word of God are greatly multiplying at the present day. The student of the divine oracles is not likely to be left destitute of means for carrying forward his favorite pursuit. Every day seems to bring new contributions in this direction, immediately into his hands. The work, the title of which is given above, is destined to fill a prominent place in the general sphere just indicated.

Dr. Oosterzee is acknowledgedly not only the ablest theological writer in the Reformed Church of Holland, but also occupies no mean place amongst the various divines of acknowledged ability in the general Christian world. His writings have been introduced, to some extent, in translations, into this country, so that he is by no means unknown to the American Christian public. The volume before us is an admirable one of its kind. We like its terseness and its genial warmth withal. Its general orthodoxy and thoroughness are by no means its least commendations. A book like this has been greatly needed, not only for the general student of the Bible; but especially for such as are engaged in a regular course of theological study. We believe the work is destined to become a welcome and indispensable text-book in all our Theological Seminaries. F.

A COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF RELIGION. By James C. Moffat, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. Part I. Ancient Scriptures. New York: Dodd & Mead, 762 Broadway.

The subject treated in this work is one of growing interest and importance at the present time. There have not been wanting those, who have been lately going over at least a portion of the field covered by it, and presenting the results as professedly reached by them, in such form as not always to make the most favorable impression in regard to the superiority claimed for the Chrisrian religion above every other. A more thorough and impartial research, such as is carried forward in this work, cannot but lead to more happy conclusions.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1872.

ART. I.—THE RELATION OF THE FORMAL AND MATERIAL PRINCIPLES OF PROTESTANTISM TO THE PRINCIPLE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. T. G. APPLE.

THE beginning of Christianity, and its foundation, must be found in the union of the divine and human natures in the incarnation of the Son of God. In the unfolding of the life of Christ, comprehending His words and works, reaching through suffering and death to His resurrection and ascension, our fallen humanity was delivered from the curse of the law, lifted up above the power of death, and endowed with glory and immortality in communion with God. In this view the work of redemption is finished. In Christ the destiny of humanity is reached and realized. In Him is fulfilled the headship over the world designed for man in his original creation. "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; Thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor."

The redemptive work, as wrought out by Christ, and as thus finished, must now be applied. This presents to us a new beginning in the Pentecostal Gift, the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the founding of the Christian Church. The office of the Holy Ghost, as described by our Saviour Himself, is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto His people. (John xvi. 13, 14, 15.) This office we can properly understand as no other than the mediation of the life of Christ to those that believe. The Holy Spirit does not come merely to represent an absent Christ, but He comes as the Spirit of Christ to bring into life-union Christ and His people. Christ becomes thus the vital source of new life for man. His life is the principle of their life. In other words, the life of Christ, in His mystical presence through the Holy Ghost, is *the principle of Christianity.*

The historical Christ and the mystical Christ are one Christ under different forms of manifestation. Christ as a historical person, having finished the work of man's redemption, now lives and reigns at the right hand of the Father, and is no longer on earth in outward, visible presence. But in the power and grace of His glorified life, He is present in His Church, through the Holy Ghost, always unto the end of the world. This presence of Christ forms the principle of the new creation as it exists in the Kingdom of grace on earth. There is here but one principle of Christianity.

To be brought into such relation to Christ, to be made a member of Him, a partaker of His life, is to be regenerated, or born again. Thus the Christian Church had its origin on the day of Pentecost in the new birth of the Spirit. The implantation and unfolding of this new life in man comprehends all that is included in his redemption.

It must be evident now that the only true object of faith is Christ Himself. We dare not substitute for Him any words of instruction which He uttered, as thongh we should take some proposition in regard to His person, or some doctrine, and rest upon this for salvation. Not His words apart from His person can be the true object of faith. These words always

directed men to Himself as the Saviour in whom they were to believe, and they had power, were spirit and life, just because they were utterances from the fountain of life in His person.

Neither dare we substitute for Christ any work that He performed as the true object of faith. He obeyed the divine law in our stead, He suffered and died for us, and rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven. To take this now as a statement or proposition, and to say that we are to make this the object of faith, is to substitute a false object for the true one. It is true, in the Creed, we do confess our faith in Jesus Christ, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, crucified, dead and buried, who rose again from the dead and ascended to heaven, etc., but here we have the works of Christ as they constitute parts or elements of His personal life. We do not make these works as something apart from His person, much less any propositions in regard to these works, objects of faith, but *Christ Himself*—"I believe in Jesus Christ."

Such faith in Christ contains first and germinally that He is the Son of God incarnate, God and man in one person, the promised Messiah, who came to deliver man from sin and death. All who came to Him, oppressed with a sense of sin, longing to be redeemed from its power, and looked to Him only for redemption, thus reaching out towards, and embracing Him, were accepted and made His disciples. In the Apostolic Church this, it seems, was all that was required as a condition for discipleship. The challenge made was, believest thou that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God? In this was wrapped up the whole mystery. It is not necessary to attempt to analyze what all was involved here for the understanding. Some, doubtless, penetrated farther into the contents of their faith in the way of knowledge than others. For all it involved a sense of sin and the need of deliverance, a renunciation of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and such full committal of the life to Christ as to render its subjects willing to follow Him whithersoever He would lead them, even to the death of martyrdom.

The faith of the early Christians, however, was germinal. It gradually unfolded its contents, one of the occasions for which was the rise of error, against which it now began to defend itself, and from which it began to distinguish itself. This was the burden of the problem of early Christianity. It settled in the œcumenical creeds and confessions who and what Christ is, as the object of faith. Faith and knowledge are intimately related to each other. The contents of the former are also the contents of the latter. Hence when false objects are set before the knowing faculties, if accepted, they reach back upon and tend to vitiate the faith, just as false objects of faith must also become error for knowledge.

Without now attempting to follow the course of the principle of Christianity in its unfolding in the life of the Church, let us pass at once to the consideration of the two leading principles of Protestantism, in order to find their relation to it. It is important to understand this relation, especially that we may avoid the error of making either the one or the other of these the fundamental principle of Christianity itself. This is frequently done. By some the Scriptures, as the only rule of faith, are made the principle of Christianity, by others, justification by faith. Neither of these is this principle, nor both combined.

The first of these Protestant principles, the inspired Scriptures the only rule of faith, finds its necessity in the fact that Christ and His inspired apostles are no longer present on earth to teach men by sensible words. That teaching at the beginning was necessary in order that men might be brought to believe in Christ.

The words of Christ had for their object to call men to Himself. He did not teach a system of salvation that stood apart from, and independent of Himself. He was, Himself, the personal truth, and the personal life. All His parables, His moral teachings, His invitations, His rebukes, His exposition of prophecy and type, all were intended to draw men to Himself as the personal source of light, life, and salvation for the world. The teachings of the apostles had the same object in

view. They proclaimed the life of Christ, they pointed men to what He taught and what He performed, they held up for condemnation false systems, and for justification the true, in order that men might be led to Christ, and continue to live in union with Him. These inspired teachings are the historical basis for the preaching of the Gospel throughout all ages, and this preaching of Christ is one of the means or instrumentalities which He employs to lead men to believe on Him as their only Saviour from sin and death.

Here now the issue was joined between the Reformers and the Roman Church, or the leaders in that Church. The Reformers maintained that the only infallible directory and guide in reference to what we are to believe is contained in the inspired Scriptures. The Romanist maintains that in addition to Holy Scripture we must also receive the tradition of the Church as of equal authority.

The Protestant view in regard to the inspired Scriptures as the only infallible rule of faith presupposes, of course, a regenerate, believing Church, to whom they were given, and by whom they are to be interpreted, for it was never for a moment supposed or taught that the natural mind could apprehend the truth they contain.

On this point Protestantism stands just where Romanism stands. The Romanist maintains that his rule of faith, consisting of Holy Scripture and tradition, must be interpreted and expounded by the Church. The Protestant maintains that his rule of faith, the inspired Scriptures alone, are to be understood and interpreted only by those who are in sympathy with the substance they contain, who are directed by the Holy Spirit. But just here the Romanist claims an advantage. His rule of faith is not a rule for mere private judgment. The Church must explain what the Scripture means, and what is the tradition of the Church. But when we come to inquire how this is done, we find that the process has been a historical process, through synods, councils, and especially often through leading men, as Athanasius, who became the expounder of the true faith even for councils. The Romanist maintains indeed that it is other-

wise, that the Church gives expression through an appointed infallible organ, and this organ, according to the decision of the late Vatican Council, is the Pope. But this is only a violent and monstrous assumption which a large portion of the Roman Church itself refuses to accept. As it is considered so important and vital by the Romanist that he can point to the infallible organ through whom the Scriptures and tradition are to be interpreted, and as he triumphantly charges that the Protestant can point to no such fixed organ, we need only say in reply that the whole force of the argument is lost when we consider the fact, that it is only after eighteen centuries that the Roman Church has been able to decide who and where their infallible organ is. Whether the infallibility lay in the council, or in the Pope, or in both, has been left an open question, until the holding of the Vatican Council in this nineteenth century. If, now, the Romanist replies, "It does not matter just where the infallibility lies, if only the faithful believe that it is in the Church," then the Protestant is just as well off, for he too can point to the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth. Only he regards the manner in which the Spirit guides the Church into the knowledge of the truth as more historical and free. The manner in which the Protestant faith has come to expression in catechisms and confessions, through synods and conferences, in a truly historical way, differs in no essential feature from the manner in which the faith of the early Church came to its expression. But it was not our purpose to enter upon this argument, and we leave it now, to carry out our line of thought which we have interrupted by this reference to Romanism.

How is the formal principle of Protestantism related to the principle of Christianity? We answer, in general, the former is subordinate to the latter, and should never be elevated to an equality with it, nor identified with it. The principle of Christianity pertains to its essence, the formal principle of Protestantism relates only to the instrumental means by which the substance of Christianity is made to confront our faith. Of course we acknowledge that by the inspired Scriptures

here, we are to understand, not merely natural letters and words, and ink and paper, as though these had a magical influence in them. There are those who turn this legitimate principle of the Reformation into a magical bibliolatry, in true Roman Catholic style. We recognize here the words of Scripture as containing the teachings of Christ and His disciples. In this highest and best sense, however, they are not Christ, nor the life of Christ, but they only lead to Christ. They do not constitute the proper object of faith, they do not save us. They only direct to this object, to Him who alone saves.

As the Scriptures do not become themselves the object of faith, do not take the place of Christ, so also they are not designed to take the place of the Church creed. The Holy Scriptures are not a creed, nor indeed are they formally the source of the creed. The creed of the Church was organizing itself while the Scriptures were settling themselves into form as the inspired canon. The creed sets forth the same matter with which the Scriptures are concerned, but the latter present this matter for instruction, the former as a confession of faith. Hence the Church has always recognized the important place occupied by the œcumenical creeds. They exhibit to us the order in which the Church apprehended the object of faith. They perform a very different office from that of Scripture. The two are not in rivalry with each other. To say, we have the inspired Scriptures, and therefore we do not need any creeds, is just to misapprehend the difference between them. But while creed does not originate in Scripture, yet we must grant that the Scriptures are a critical standard by which the creed must submit to be judged. If there is anything in the creeds of the Church that is not in agreement with the Scripture it must be ruled out, for no creeds are inspired in the same sense in which the Scriptures are inspired.

The Word of God as contained in the inspired Scriptures, stands above all other writings which the Church has produced. Yet it is not the Bible that brings salvation. The period of orthodoxy and confessionalism in the seventeenth century be-

came cold and barren just because it treated the Scriptures as though they were the source of salvation. "Ye search the Scriptures because *in them ye think* ye have eternal life," forgetting that it is the office of Scripture to testify of Christ. "They are they which testify of me." That with which the Scripture is occupied in presenting it in outward form, is also the substance of the Christian life. The two are indeed correlative. The unfolding of the regenerate life must continually submit itself to the judgment of the inspired Word, yet this life itself does not owe its origin to the written Word, but proceeds from Christ.

In this view it is that the Reformation developed another principle, standing to some extent independent of the formal principle to which we have referred, and which is sometimes called *the principle* of Protestantism, viz: *the principle of justification by faith.*

The legalistic tendency in the Roman Church, according to which Christianity came to be looked upon rather as law than Gospel, led its members to seek for justification through works of obedience, acts of penance, etc. The objective righteousness of Christ which is the ground of our justification before God was not distinguished from that righteousness as it becomes ours in the unfolding of our new life in sanctification. The former is perfect, and therefore is the ground of a perfect justification, while the latter is imperfect, being only in process of reaching its true completion. The objective righteousness of Christ does not indeed stand out of and apart from the believer, so that his justification rests upon a mere outward, mechanical substitution. That righteousness becomes his as a true and real inheritance and possession, but as such it is not identical with the subjective righteousness of the believer, but stands related to this as the source of his life to its unfolding. This righteousness of Christ becomes ours in the new birth of water and the Spirit, but its conscious appropriation can be only through faith. Hence the Reformers taught that man is justified by faith, not by works, though it must never be forgotten that good works are internally and organically united to faith.

Of course the conception of faith here is quite different from the Roman view. The council of Trent, in which this subject was discussed, presented as one of the points to be condemned, that "justifying faith is a sure trust, by which one believeth that his sins are remitted for Christ's sake; and those that are justified are bound to believe certainly that their sins are remitted." Faith, according to the Roman view, is only an assent to what God has spoken. "All agreed," we are told in the history of the discussion in the council, "that justifying faith is an assent to whatever is revealed by God, or determined by the Church to be believed. But to take faith for a trust and confidence, is not only an improper kind of speaking, but abusive, never received by St. Paul." Again it was said, "That no man, without presumption, could assume himself that he was in grace, but ought always to doubt," etc.*

The Protestant Reformation brought out the subjective factor in redemption, and gave it new significance, just as they had also separated the objective revelation through the inspired word from the errors with which it had become intermingled. Faith here became an inward activity of the spirit, by which it laid hold of the object in a real way, and hence carried with it an assurance which could come in no other way.†

It must be plain, now, that however important the principle of justification by faith is, it is not the principle of Christianity. It pertains to the soteriological principle of Christianity, which itself is not the whole of Christianity. True, this principle of justification by faith is far-reaching, and may become, indeed, a touch-stone, or criterion, by which to judge other principles,

* Hist. Council of Trent. Translated by Brent, 2d Ed., p. 192.

† We present this as important to be considered when the Church of Rome urges that it alone affords *certainty* for the struggling soul. The certainty it proposes, however ,is of a superficial character, after all, even granting its assumptions of infallibility to be true; for the certainty here amounts only to this, that what it teaches is true, but the individual is left still to struggle with other questions, whether his repentance and confession are complete, whether he is in grace, etc. Such assent merely, does not bring the soul into union with the true object of faith. It is very much on a par with that false Protestant conception by which the Scriptures, or their absolute truthfulness, is made to be the object of faith. Newman's doctrine of assent comes only to this at last.

but it is by no means the whole of Christianity, as it was never claimed to be by the Reformers.

In the first place, it must always be complemented by the formal principle, which relates to the inspired Word of God. Separated from this it leads to a mere subjectivism, which in the end projects its own object, and so denies the true object of faith. "When the individual Christian severs himself from all connection with history and tradition, and lightly esteems the written word, relying upon his being born of the Spirit, and accordingly needing no Christ outside of himself,—then originate *sects*, based on visionariness and fanaticism. . . . . Since this disregard of the Church and of the Bible is at the same time a disregard of 'Christ outside of us,' it leads logically to a denial of the miracle of the Incarnation; and then the subjective religion ceases to be subjective Christianity. For what it calls Christ 'in us,' is nothing but a general idea; what it calls the inner light, is merely the light of nature, wrapped in a mist, colored by Christianity." *

Not only is the principle of justification by faith dependent for its right standing upon its right relation to the outward inspired word, it relates, as we have said, only to the soteriological element of Christology, and is by no means the whole of Christianity. This was seen when Luther came to adjust it with the doctrine of the sacraments, as also embraced in the Christian system, and also in its soteriological department. And this adjustment is just one of the perplexing problems which Protestant theology is still occupied with. This problem presented itself to Luther, and we are told by Dorner †, that at first he seemed disposed to undervalue the significance of the sacraments in favor of his principle of justification by faith. In the year 1518 he declares the leading principle to be: What-

* How clearly Dr. Nevin grasped the central error, the *proton pseudos*, of the sect system, may be seen by reading his tract on Anti-Christ, published years ago, in which he pointed out just this heresy, that it denied that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, the mystery of the Incarnation, as Dr. Martensen also says, from whom we quote the above.

† Hist. Prot. Theology.

ever may be the case with the sacraments, faith must maintain its rights and honors. Also that faith may receive apart from the sacrament the same thing as in the sacrament, namely, the forgiveness of sins (through faith in the Word). This position, as we know, was assailed with effect by the Romanists. Subsequently Luther, and Protestantism generally, settled down into a better adjustment of the principle of justification by faith, with the meaning of the sacraments, but we know that the problem presents difficulties even yet. Especially do we see this in the treatment of Infant Baptism. The Episcopal Convention, which recently convened in Baltimore, leaves the question quite unsettled, and we find their ministers still perplexed as much as ever in regard to it. Is the child justified in Baptism? We believe that if it dies it is saved. Is it saved without justification? We ask the question only to reveal the nature of the problem which here meets us. We know the tendency of one-sided Protestantism to undervalue the sacraments. In some denominations but few children, comparatively, are baptized, and in others infant baptism is repudiated altogether. Those among the Reformed, also, who regard the sacraments as mere signs to confirm our faith, fail to apprehend the true relation here.

Sometimes they proceed so far as to make faith a means of grace, substituting it thus in place of the sacraments themselves. To be consistent, then, they would have to displace also the Word. They charge gross and dangerous heresy on those who regard the sacraments as saving means of grace, urging that we are saved by grace *through faith*, as though this in any way contradicted the full significance of the sacraments as a means of grace. They urge that we are partakers of Christ through faith, not through the sacraments, strangely confounding faith as the apprehending and receptive organ in us, with those means through which grace is made to confront us. We refer to these points, not for the purpose of discussing them, but to show that these Protestant principles, either one of them or both, cannot be regarded as absolutely central in the Christian system, and that they need to be properly adjusted in that system as a whole.

In the opening of this article we briefly indicated what must be confessed by all as the principle of Christianity. It is the Christological principle. This principle stood out prominently in the primitive church, and by its central position, and in its wholeness, it moulded early Christianity. In the Mediæval period the principle of Ecclesiasticism came to be regarded as central, as it is now in the Roman Catholic Church. At the Reformation the Christological principle came to assert its power again, but with special application only to the rule of faith and justification by faith. It rooted out false ecclesiasticism in the authority that had come to be attached to tradition, and to the independent efficacy of the sacraments as they came to be separated from the sacrifice of Christ. But this was only a partial application of the principle. Now that Protestantism has maintained the contest with Rome, and acquired for itself an independent position,—now that it has developed the meaning of its formal and material principles, it must realize that it stands in a broader principle, and it must seek to comprehend, in their right adjustment, its particular principles in one that is central and Catholic.

Of course, Protestantism has always stood in this Christological principle, in other words, it has stood in Christianity as something broader and deeper than Protestantism. But it must come to apprehend itself as thus related, and in the light of this relation, interpret its catechisms and confessions. This calls for no new creed—such Catholic creed is already at hand,—it was incorporated in the most important Protestant Confession, viz.: The Apostles' Creed. That creed is Christological, it makes Christ centrally the object of faith. It looks to Christ in the wholeness of His person and work, His incarnation and His suffering, His death and His resurrection, and His ascension and session at the right hand of God. Christ as thus central for faith reveals to us the Father, and is present with us by the Holy Ghost, through whom the Holy Catholic Church unfolds itself as the mystical body of Christ, in whose bosom we enjoy the blessed communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting.

This creed, we say, was incorporated in the Reformation Catechisms and Confessions of Faith, and was looked upon as the creed of Christendom by the Reformers. But Protestantism had to do directly with special problems, and in its engrossing interest in these, it is not strange that it should fail to grasp at once with equal vigor the whole Christian system, or rather to adjust its new principles just in their proper relations in this system as a whole. Hence the creed which Lutheran and Reformed catechisms set forth as containing the whole Christian faith *in sum*, and which Calvin made the basis of his *Institutes*, gradually fell into the background. In many sections of Protestantism it has come to have a strange sound, and in some sections, as in Puritanism, it has pretty much disappeared altogether. There are, indeed, some among us who find no particular significance in this. They imagine that Puritanism can be theologically sound without the creed as well as with it; for does it not still hold to the doctrine of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ (at least in its orthodox wing) the depravity of human nature, the necessity of regeneration, etc., etc.? But the case requires more than merely the holding of such doctrines in their separate capacity. They will take their coloring and shade of meaning according to the principle by which they are held together as a whole. And where this principle is not the right one, the central one, separate and independent doctrines must gradually fall into a false interpretation also.

Systems of theology, though they may in a traditionary way still incorporate them for study, will necessarily lose their vigor, if they are not formed and informed by the one central principle of Christianity. Failing to grasp this principle as it organizes itself in the Apostles' Creed, theologians will be led, consciously or unconsciously, to find some other principle, according to which they construct their systems. Church worship, and Church Government, and Christian Ethics, will revolve around another principle. Even the truths they contain will take a false coloring by reason of the wrong relation they are made to stand to each other. This seems to be, in part at least, the cause of the confusion which prevails in Protestant

systems. They are casting about to find the true centre, the one informing principle. One finds it in the divine decree, another in a peculiar feature of the Church, as the Episcopal succession, another in its particular view of conversion, another in a form of baptism, and thus parties and sections are arrayed against each other, instead of blending together in one common communion.

But will a mere acceptance of the Apostles' Creed provide any remedy for this division and confusion? By no means; any more than the acceptance of the Bible has brought unity to Protestant confessions. Some have sought a remedy for existing evils in this outward way. Let us take the œcumenical creeds, and cast away all our other symbols. All would depend on the sense which we carry into the creed, and if this sense is as various as Protestant confessions themselves, what unity could be reached in this way?

But what is required is, that we lay hold of the creed as organized on the Christological principle, having Christ for its centre, and seek to adjust our Protestant principles with it. In doing this, while the creed will carry with it its old historical sense, it will also come to have for us a new sense, perfectly consistent with the old. Its articles, in their explanation, will be divested also of all erroneous appendages which were connected with them by Romanism. The "credo," "I believe," will carry with it all the emphasis which Protestantism gives to faith. Yet the old creed will speak out for us the faith of the early Church, as this faith comes to us through the Reformation, and stands livingly in the life of the Church now.

This is not repristination. It is not going back to early Christianity, with a view to transport it over the centuries that intervene, and land it whole in this 19th century. This is just one of the errors against which, what is called, Mercersburg theology set itself from the beginning. But it will be early Christianity, of the Catholic period, living and speaking in the modern period.

This would serve to enable our Protestant confessions to overcome the one-sidedness which clings to them in one way

or another. Take, for instance, the doctrine of the Atonement. This seems to have no power to set itself in right relation to the incarnation. The death of Christ, as the expiatory sacrifice, is all that it can recognize as having to do with our deliverance from sin and death. The satisfaction made to divine justice in our Saviour's death, and our deliverance from the curse by a forensic imputation of His merits are the only elements that it can posit in the doctrine of the atonement. The conception of an Atonement as lying also, and primarily we may say, in the union of God and man in the person of Christ, whereby our nature was brought into reconciliation with God first of all in the incarnation,—this seems to find no place in the doctrine as ordinarily exhibited. Clearly one phase of the Saviour's life, one portion of His redemptive work, is here substituted for the meaning of His whole person and work.

The wrong way in which the written word has, by many, come to be viewed, as separated from the incarnate Word, as He ever lives in His Church, is another illustration. The empirical theory of the Church by which it is made to be a result of a union of regenerated individuals, instead of that bosom of grace, the mother of us all, the body of Christ, is still another. The rationalistic theory of the sacraments, according to which they are denied all positive objective contents, resulting from a false view of Christ's presence, and a false view of the relation of faith to the means of grace, may be cited as another example. Nor should we leave out of our enumeration the seeming tendency in the better Lutheranism of our times, to make a Reformation symbol, sound doctrine, the principle of the Church's life. But we need not extend this reference to examples.

Protestantism will reveal such one-sided tendencies in all directions until it comes to a fuller, clearer, consciousness of the one principle of its life, and makes this principle central in its apprehension of the Christian system. Here we must find the only true remedy for the helplessness of our divisions. These divisions all hang upon the emphasizing of one or another feature of Christianity, without embracing it in its true Catholicity. Let the Christ-principle, which is the principle of the

creed, apprehend us, and let us come to apprehend it in its central significance, and we will have power to begin to surmount those narrow lines of separation by which we are now held apart, and the denominations of the Protestant Church will merge into the Reformed Catholic Church.

ART. II.—THE IDEA OF CHURCH AUTHORITY: A LETTER.

BY REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

INTRODUCTORY.

MR. EDITOR:—Shortly after coming to Lancaster to open the Theological Seminary, a letter of inquiry was addressed to me relative to some of the questions at issue between the Roman and the Protestant Churches. The point to which the writer referred more particularly was the historical authority of the Roman Catholic Church, and its bearing on the validity of the Reformation. We all confess: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." Does the disruption of the sixteenth century involve a violation of this article of the Creed?

In my reply, I expressed my willingness to assist him, so far as I might be able, in coming to a right conclusion on a question of such grave character. But as the greater part of my time was occupied with my regular work in the Seminary, and I did not wish to write without some previous reflection, I would need a few weeks to prepare a proper answer to his inquiry. Meanwhile, however, I stated, that the Roman theory of the primacy of St. Peter, of the unity of the Church, and the authoritative teaching of the truth (for these things were closely connected), was to my mind clearly false, by which I meant to say, that the Roman theory was contrary to the objective idea of the Gospel, to the teachings of the New Testament, the nature of the Church Catholic, and to the spirit of sound Christological thinking.

In due time I fulfilled my promise, and forwarded an answer. A few friends, with whom I had occasion to confer on the subject, believe that the paper may serve a wider purpose than that for which it was originally intended. Acquiescing in this opinion, I have revised it with some care, and now place it at your disposal for publication in the "*Review.*"

Yours truly, E. V. G.

Theological Seminary, Feb. 22d, 1872.

DEAR SIR:—In your letter of September 20th, you ask: "Where is the AUTHORITY for turning away from the voice of the Church, as it had uttered itself through the *General Council* all along, to the voice of the Reformers?" and "desire to be informed of the fallacy," which your thoughts on the question of Church Authority may contain.

Your request assumes, that the Roman Catholic idea of Church authority may not be the true idea; also that the true idea of authority, and of authoritative teaching, may evince the fallacy of the Roman position, that the Reformation movement is a breach of faith in the article of the Creed: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." This assumption is both legitimate and necessary. It underlies an inquiry into the main question at issue. The Roman theory, or the principle which this theory involves, denies not only the possibility of any other valid conception of Church authority, but also the right and propriety of thinking on this subject from any other point of observation. If we concede this principle, we beg the question; we grant the position with all its consequences, which we propose to consider, and thus bar out all free inquiry. There would remain then, if consistent, nothing else for us to do, than to acquiesce passively in all the claims and pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church.

Assuming then with you, whatever may be the merits of the Roman theory, that there is room for another conception of Church authority, and that it is legitimate to pursue an inquiry

from a different stand-point, I proceed to give you my answer to the main question of your letter.

Church Authority Related to the Church.

The idea of Church authority is necessarily connected with the idea of the *Church*. As is the nature and vocation of the Church, so will be the nature of the authority which she possesses.

If the Church be a purely supernatural organization, instituted and commissioned extra-naturally by God, to testify of Christ and His salvation, to authenticate Christ and teach divine truth in definite ultimate propositions; and, if thus commissioned, she bears a fixed and unchangeable character throughout all the ages; then will her authority likewise be external and extra-natural, and confront us at all times in an ultimate form of definite teaching. But if the Church be an organism, in which the supernatural and the natural are both essential factors; if she is consequently a real new existence inwardly connected with the present order of things; and if it is her vocation to actualize the truth in her spiritual and ethical life, and teach the truth, not in ultimate propositions, but in a progressive form corresponding to the development of her life; then is her divine authority in like manner internal and intra-natural, and apprehends us as a concrete power, always deeper, broader, mightier than any formula of teaching in language.

These two ideas are but two aspects of one fact. Being so closely allied, they modify each other reciprocally. A defective view of the Church involves a defective view of her authority. The latter, moreover, is commensurate with the former. They prevail in the same degree. Hence a false conception of the Church renders a true view of church authority impossible.

Our dissent from the Roman Church, on the question of Church authority, does not spring from a denial that she is a branch of the Church of Christ, nor from a denial of Church authority as such. Nor does it spring simply from the fact, that she has abused her legitimate authority. But we dissent from the claims of the Roman Church, because these claims contravene the idea of the essential nature of the Church

Catholic herself, as this is revealed in her Apostolic origin, her history and final destiny.

The Church Related to Christianity.

The idea of the Church, however, is not original and autonomic. It is necessarily connected with the idea of *Christianity* or the *Christian religion*, as distinguished from the religions and philosophies of the world. The terms *Christianity* and *Church* are not synonymous. Apart from any definite conception of either one or both, so much at least is to be asserted, that the latter is not commensurate with the former. The objective faith of the Church, Greek, Roman, and Protestant, comprehends more, both intensively and extensively, than the Church herself actually is now, or has been, or ever will be, so long as the present fallen mundane order prevails.

Looking backward, Christianity includes the Person, the personal life, the work, and the perfection of Christ in His glorification, as antecedent to the proper founding of the Church on the day of Pentecost. Looking forward, Christianity takes in teleologically, as being essential to the completeness of divine revelation, the Second Coming of Christ and all the Last Things—among these the passing away of the present mundane order, the resurrection, the destruction of death, and the transition of the Church from the state militant to the state triumphant. This transition implies an organic change in her constitution,—a change in kind and degree like that which her living Head underwent in passing from His state in the flesh to His state in glory.

Now the Church is in her time state. This is intermediate between the ascension and glorification of her Head, and His coming again to judge the quick and the dead. She is indeed His mystical body, the present actual form of Christianity, the established economy in which Christ lives and reigns on the earth. But the Church is the actual form of Christianity only in a relative, not in an absolute sense. It is self-evident, that the actualization cannot be more complete than the objective truth which is actualized; that the economy cannot be more

perfect than the mystery which originates, warrants and fills the economy.

Christianity is itself only relatively complete. The Second Advent is still a future fact, not yet a reality; but though not yet real, it is nevertheless the culminating fact of divine revelation. It is the final grand conclusion. This event will not be superadded, externally, to all previous acts of Jesus Christ, assuming that these are in and for themselves final and whole; but, being inwardly and dynamically related to the Church, to Pentecost and the Ascension, it will come as the full ripe fruit of all antecedent revelation, and thus be the perfection, not only of Christianity as to its general idea, but also of every necessary fact and element that enters into its constitution.

So mysteriously is the Second Advent related to every previous fact of revelation, that to deny it is to resolve the entire Christian faith into a delusive, empty dream; or to ignore it, and yet endeavor whilst ignoring it, to form a true conception of the Church or of our Lord, is to be so far forth necessarily disqualified for the attempt. Every conception of Christianity formed in the light only of what has thus far been brought to pass in the actual history of the world, will be as defective as was the conception which the unbelieving Pharisees formed of Moses and the Mosaic economy, whilst they refused to recognize in the incarnate Word, or in the first Advent of Christ, the true end and fulfillment of the ceremonial economy which God established by Moses. Or, it is like an attempt to pass judgment on the meaning of the "blade" whilst we leave out of view the relation which the "ear," and the "full corn in the ear" bear to the blade.

There is another analogy that is still closer and more pertinent. The Second Advent is related to the antecedent revelation like the resurrection of Christ from the dead to His crucifixion, His life in the flesh and holy nativity. The force and meaning of these mysterious facts became manifest by His victory over death. Until then their virtue was in abeyance,—was not an actual power of redemption. Being thus concretely related, we can form no Christian conception of His death but in the light of His resurrection. Could we suppose that

Christ did not really rise from the dead, we would by the supposition at once resolve His life into a delusion or imposture, and reduce His crucifixion to the character of an heroic or merely tragical event.

So does the Second Advent fulfill and make real the sense and purpose of Pentecost, or the true nature and virtue of the Church. Sin still prevails, though it is the mission of the Church to save men from sin. Death still reigns over all men, saints and sinners, notwithstanding the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church. There is in her bosom forgiveness of sins and eternal life. Yet the law of sin is not abolished, and eternal life is still only possible and potential, not a realized fact. The possible and potential will become a glorious reality when Christ shall consummate the mystery of grace in His Second Coming; and in the consummation of His revelation also consummate with Himself His mystical body. Until then the true nature and full meaning of the present militant, interimistic period of Christianity, can as little manifest and authenticate itself perfectly, as could the victory of Christ, achieved in His death, be made manifest before He came forth in triumph from the state of the dead.

In the Second Advent, accordingly, Christianity will become the absolutely complete divine revelation.

Christianity is thus much broader than the Church; and our idea of the former must be determinative of our idea of the latter. Not the reverse. We cannot judge of Christianity by what the Church is in idea or in fact; not by what she has suffered, achieved and accomplished, in her history extending through nineteen centuries; but we must judge of the nature and mission of the Church by what Christianity is.

We do not imply, however, that we can judge of Christianity independently of the existence, life and teaching of the Church, or independently of communion with Christ in the bosom of the Church.

Yet even a general idea of Christianity, approximately true though it be, is not normative. There is still a deeper idea; and with this all sound reflection on the nature of the Church and Church authority must begin.

Christianity Related to Christ.

The idea of Christianity is organically connected with the *idea of Christ.* Jesus Christ is Himself the *principle* of divine revelation, of His religion, of His Holy Catholic Church, of Church authority, and of all valid teaching of the truth. The Christ idea is therefore the unchangeable type and the fundamental, all-governing law of Christian thinking on all questions respecting the constitution and vocation of His mystical body. This idea is given in the one universal Faith of the Church in all ages: I believe in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary. It is given in this Faith as having been quickened and evoked primarily by our Lord Himself; not by what He taught in words, but by what He was as the Word made flesh. The idea is given in this Faith also as exhibited in the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, which is the most perfect image and reflection of the objective Truth in human language. As compared with the Personal Word, however, the written word possesses only secondary force. Not the doctrinal utterances of Christ or of His apostles, not any secret communication concerning His kingdom, but *He* is truth. "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." He in His own Person and life-acts, is the true, concrete revelation of God to man for all time.

Jesus Christ, being the eternal Son of God, is *supernatural.* As to His divine essence and attributes, His divine mode of existence and authority, He is above the natural world. He and nature are distinct and opposite; but they are not contradictory. Only in as far as the natural is perverted and governed by sin and Satan, can we allow that any contradiction prevails between it and the supernatural. Nature as to its original idea, law, activity and teleology, reveals the Logos, declares the glory of the Lord. He is indeed before all things, and all things were created by Him, yet all things now as ever consist, or stand together, in Him. Whilst we emphasize the generic difference between the Creator and the creature, between the Logos and the "all things" which were made by Him, we must also emphasize the original harmony and correspondence of

the "things" made with the will and life of the Maker, of the word spoken with the Word speaking. Nor has this harmony been annihilated by the fall; as if now the Creator and the things created were dualistically divided and separated. The Lord is "not far from every one of us." There is no infinite distance, no impassable gulf, between God and man. On the contrary, so intimate and permanent is the relation, that men, though perverted and held under bondage to Satan by the power of sin, still live their proper human life in God. "For in Him, we live, and move and have our being." Hence man feels the discord and contradiction of sin, and desires deliverance. Hence, too, there is in his nature the necessity and the capacity of true living communion with God in the domain of a new creation.

This dark desire of mankind as well as the hope of Israel, is fulfilled in Jesus Christ. The divine Logos descends really into the bosom of the old creation, and by a new creative act analogous to that by which heaven and earth were made, assumes man, the head of the natural world, into life union with Himself. Being supernatural, Christ is thus also truly *natural.* The Word was made *flesh.* The true God was manifest *in the flesh;* not in or by something else; or in any other way than *in* real humanity. He who was in the form of God, took upon Him the form of a servant, and was found *in fashion as a man.* This fact that the Son, God of God, was made *man;* that the Creator took the creature into organic union with Himself; that the eternal life of God and the temporal life of man became one, one new personal life in the mystery of the incarnation, and in such sense that this Jesus, the Son of Man, is to be received and confessed as the absolute and ultimate manifestation of God, and the infinite fulness of all revelation;—this glorious fact recognized and confessed in the power of the Spirit, is the rock on which the Church is built, and the touchstone by which all religious beliefs and religious theories are to be tried. It, and it alone, uncovers anti-Christ and anti-Christian tendencies in the Church and in the world. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is *come in the*

flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God."

In Christ the divine does not stand above the human, and compel the submission of the human to itself. Nor does the divine attest the truth to the human, requiring the human to acknowledge and passively receive the truth on the ground of infallible divine attestation, as if the truth concerning grace and salvation were, on the one hand, not the divine, and on the other, not the human, but something intermediate between both, which the divine teaches and the human accepts. In Him the divine is not external authority for the human, nor is the human bound to renounce the prerogative of freedom, its true autonomic power, and submit to be determined exclusively and absolutely by the divine. There is no *natura docens* on the one side, and no *natura credens* on the other, as if the latter stood apart from the former.

On the contrary, in Christ, the divine and the human, though each one is veritable and distinct, are the momenta of one living, concrete whole. The divine is *in* the human, not mechanically, but organically; conserving the law and normal life of the human in the assumption of man into God. The incarnate mystery is a constitution in which the human is active autonomically, that is, in full harmony with itself as created in the image and likeness of God. Being thus conserved in this mystery and active freely according to its own law, the human is not overwhelmed by the divine, but becomes the very form of the existence of the divine in time and space. Instead of receiving a revelation by communication from the divine, the human is, itself, an essential constituent factor of revelation.

What is revealed? God in man, man in union with God. That which is revealed, and that which reveals are one. Here we have the idea of revelation; we have also the idea of truth. Truth is the new reality. The living union and communion of the divine with the human and of the human with the divine in one Person, Jesus Christ, is the substantive truth that confronts faith.

Jesus Christ as being thus the divine in the human, *authenticates Himself.* As self-authenticating, He is *the object of saving faith.* And as the true object of faith, the object which evokes the spontaneous response of faith, Christ possesses and exercises that ethical power which is *authority.*

These three aspects of the life and character of our Lord, I proceed to consider, in their bearing upon your principal question.

Christ Self-authenticating.

Jesus Christ as the Revelation, the Truth, is *self-authenticating.* Risen and glorified, He authenticates Himself to men in that He is present on earth in the Spirit.

The apostles do not authenticate Him, neither the Apostolic Church; but He authenticates *them.* In and by Him, who quickened them through the Spirit given as the fruit of His glorification, they become partakers of His glorified life and the bearers of His mediatorial office on earth. They are *His* representatives and ministers. But the office which they bear is not external and abstract. It supposes the entire body mystical, which was constituted by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. This mystical body, including apostles, evangelists, elders, teachers and people,—for there are diversities of gifts and of administrations, but the same Spirit,—is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. In as far as the Church is true to her Head, and realizes His pure and holy life in her ethical and spiritual activity, does He manifest Himself in her communion. He manifests His sinless, and sin-destroying divine-human life in the life of His body which proceeds from and stands in Him, the Head; and thus in a real way authenticates Himself in and through the body. Authenticating Himself through His mystical body, He also authenticates *it*, as the bearer of His life and the home of His Spirit. I, a human person, authenticate myself in and through my natural body. Doing this, I also authenticate my natural body as the bearer and organ of my personal existence.

Neither can miracles, nor inspired language, nor the traditional faith authenticate Him. He is Himself the foundation

miracle, the revealing Word, the objective Faith, the perennial root of tradition. Apart from Him, neither sign, nor utterance, nor belief, nor tradition, can have any spiritual force. These have force and meaning only as the peculiar forms and media of His living presence and power; and not otherwise.

Much less can anything more remote authenticate Him. Like the sun, He needs no authentication, and can receive none from the earth or the heavens; but He shines by His own light through the entire new world of grace

But the absolute self-authentication of Christ does not supersede, nor is it incompatible with, an outward witnessing to His Person. There is both a divine and a human witnessing to Him.

God bore witness to the new-born King by the miraculous star of Bethlehem. At His baptism, and on the mount of transfiguration, a voice from heaven was heard, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." In like manner did the Apostles, and others, bear testimony to Christ. After the Holy Ghost was given, they went forth as the witnesses of His crucifixion, and particularly of His resurrection from the dead; everywhere proclaiming the wonderful fact, that He who was crucified and buried, had come forth from the grave and ascended to heaven. Paul was a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel. So also has the Church in every age, borne testimony, with more or less clearness and power, to the Person of Christ, and to all the mysteries of the Christian Faith.

But these testimonies were not the ground of faith in Christ as the Truth and the Life. They were not this in the first century; nor are they this to us now. These testimonies are the immediate consequences, and the legitimate manifestation in His Church of His own fulness.

Being the absolute Truth on earth; being Himself the actual revelation and reconciliation of God and man; being as the principle of the new creation also the perfecter of the old, He draws to Himself the acknowledgment of His Father from heaven. The voice from heaven does not make Christ what

He is; nor does it add to His intrinsic fulness; nor is the voice the reason why men believed in Him as the Saviour. Christ is Himself the reason of the voice. In His sinless, holy life, and in His perfect obedience to His Father's will, He authenticates Himself as true to the work which He came into the world to do, and therefore receives from His Father the witness of His favor.

So authenticating Himself in His life and resurrection and in the coming of the Holy Ghost, to His Apostles and the Apostolic Church, they go forth in the spiritual strength and spiritual light of His self-authenticating fellowship with them, and bear witness boldly before all men to the fulness of life and salvation that is in Him. The Apostles do not believe and bear witness because of the miraculous voice from heaven. But just as the glory of His Person drew forth the voice of acknowledgment from the bosom of the supernatural world, so does the same manifested glory evoke a responsive voice from the bosom of the new-born Church. Thus, as did His Father from heaven, so do His servants on earth bear outward testimony to the mystery of the Son of Man.

The same law of self-authentication prevails in the history of the Church uninterruptedly. The life-communion of Christ in the Spirit with His Church prompts, constrains and certifies the voice of testimony. But this testimony is not to men the ground of their faith. The individual believes on Christ for the same reason that the minister testifies of Him. The ground of the testimony is also the ground of faith. The testimony and faith stand in the same principle; and are possible in virtue of the same law of the Spirit. The witness of the ministry is but one form, in which Christ living in His Church, authenticates Himself to the heart of the individual as the only object of saving faith.

Christ the Object of Faith.

Jesus Christ is *the object of saving faith.* He is this object absolutely. Some make the Bible this object, supposing that the Bible, something external to Christ and to men, can save

them by its teachings. Others make the Church this object, assuming that salvation is of and from the Church, and that those who put their trust in her dogmas and ministrations, by that act repose in the Truth, as if the imperfect militant Church were identical with Christ. Both are wrong.

The *Bible* is not salvation. Though produced by inspired men, and therefore the most precious of all books, it is nevertheless only a *book*. No book can quicken the dead or save from sin. We may, indeed, ascribe supernatural power to Holy Writ. But we can do this, only when it is taken in its concrete historical relations. The written Word is not a magical phenomenon; but a real production of the Apostolic Church. The unique worth and power which it possesses proceeds from the unique life of Christ, who speaks by the Spirit through His chosen Apostles; but as Christ when in the flesh, spake in the prevailing language of men, so do the Apostles, living in the flesh as well as in the Spirit, belonging to the present order of the fallen world as well as to the new world of grace, speak and write in a truly human form. As when written, so now, the virtue of the Bible, in one respect a human production, stands altogether in its internal and indissoluble connection through the Spirit, with the infinite fulness of life and grace in Jesus Christ dwelling perennially in His Church.

Divorced from its objective connection with Christ, the written Word loses its power, and loses its legitimate authority. It becomes an external mechanical power, which does not help to save men, but rather helps to destroy them. Good itself, and mighty for good, yet when separated from its necessary ground, and made to occupy a false position, the good is turned into the relatively evil, and the Scripture glowing with the spirit of freedom, becomes a yoke of bondage.

Hence whilst we believe the Scriptures, the Scriptures are not the *object* of saving faith. Not being salvation, salvation does not flow from them nor depend on them. Led by the Spirit of Christ, we come not to the written Word, but directly to Christ Himself, as set forth and taught by the Apostles in the written Word.

Neither is the *Church* salvation. The water of life flows from the one original fountain only. Salvation is in and from the Head; not in and from the mystical body. Salvation is in the body as the subject which is being saved and to be saved, as the sphere wherein the saving power of Christ is positively active; but it is not in the body as its source and its perfect form of realization. The Church, both as a whole and as consisting of parts, renews her life and her consciousness of the forgiveness of sins, by the communion of *Christ* with her through His Spirit, and by *her* communion with Him through faith. This two-fold or reciprocal communion being continuous through all the ages that intervene between Pentecost and the Second Advent, the Church, developing and actualizing her life, is now in the *process* of salvation; a process which in no respect, whether as to holiness, unity or catholicity, can become perfect until the present disorganized world, and with it sin and death, are superseded and destroyed by Christ at His coming. The Church does not save, cannot save; to affirm it is anti-Christian, as really as to affirm that the Book saves; but the Church is saved. The Church does not deliver men from the corruption and curse of the world; but Christ delivers the Church itself from this corruption and curse. The mystical body does not sanctify the members; but the Head sanctifies the mystical body and the members in their living communion with the body.

Therefore, we believe in the Church, not in the mediæval Roman sense, but in the sense of the Apostolic Faith. We believe, not in the *Roman* Catholic Church, but in *The* Holy Catholic Church. *The* Church, the generic mystical body, is the objective sphere of faith,—the sphere within which alone true faith in Christ, the Head, and real fellowship with Him, can prevail.

We believe in the Church, in her objective *relation* and *history*. We believe in her mystical constitution as the creation of the Holy Ghost, that, despite the hostility of the world, and despite the sin, disorder and confusion that cannot but manifest themselves in her militant state, lives on by virtue of His ever-

abiding, ever-quickening, ever-sanctifying presence. And we believe in the Holy Ghost as being the gift of the ascended Christ, the fruit of His glorification and session at the right hand of God, the medium and form of His real Presence in His members on earth, and of all His saving power. And we believe in Jesus Christ as being the Son of God in the Son of Man; the second Adam; the fulness of the Godhead and the perfection of the new created humanity in one Person; the Principle and actual beginning of a new human race which He quickens into existence out of the old corrupt race in and by the Spirit; the only Redeemer and Saviour of this new, regenerated human race; the only Fountain of grace, unity, holiness, catholicity, ecclesiastical organization, who will come again to consummate what He has begun, and is now, in the midst of the prevailing kingdom of darkness, carrying forward to perfection. And we believe in God as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who manifests His essential being, eternal will, attributes, and true relation to the finite world, absolutely and perennially in the Person of Christ. The Apostolic Faith centering thus in Jesus Christ, we must recognize in His Person the proper, only, and unchangeable *object* of saving faith. On this object faith terminates.

Thus related backward to her foundation, and forward to the everlasting life, do we believe in the Holy Catholic Church as the veritable mystery of grace. But not under any different view. When the Church is cut off from and lifted out of her objective and organic relation; when her life is resolved into a given, outward form of historical organization, limiting the infinite fulness of the idea for all time to one hierarchical polity, shaped and fixed by forces as really beyond as under her control at a particular period in the history of mankind; and, when it is assumed that such outward form of organization is fully equivalent to the Faith of the Creed, which was confessed universally and for centuries before this hierarchy had any existence: then the organization becomes anti-Church and anti-Apostolic. It contradicts the very law of life which was active determinatively in the transition of the Church from

one status and form to another status and form of existence. Moreover, when such organization endeavors to maintain and perpetuate itself by the force of will as well as by violence, it becomes more abnormal and more grotesque as it grows older; for as a part of the body mystical, carrying the law of the new life in its bosom, the invisible dynamic forces, despite all arbitrary determination and constraint to the contrary, will assert their activity in some outward form, whether that be for the better or for the worse. For a time it may be both. Held under constraint by external rule, and gathering strength of impulse under repression, the dynamic forces of the mystical body, quickened by the continual communion of her Head, will react and culminate in an epoch. This epoch may be more or less convulsive, according to the kind of resistance offered by the existing form of organization about to be transcended on the one side, and on the other according to the degree in which naturalistic tendencies intermingle. But the life, surmounting the confusion of the epoch, grows into a relatively new, different and better form of existence, which, notwithstanding the convulsion, stands organically in unbroken continuity with the previous status and form of existence out of which the relatively new is born.

The false position of a given organization of the Church, corresponds in effect to the false position assigned to The Book. Where The Book usurps the place of the Gospel, its tendency is to weaken, if not to destroy, true faith in the objective Truth; and men begin to feel as if the discovery of an error in the received text involved a destruction of Christianity itself. So when a given outward hierarchical organization claims to be the full embodiment of the Church, it fails to evoke the intuitive response of the Christian consciousness. Then by the exercise of external power, it must compel the assent and submission of men to the imposed claims and pretensions. Thus instead of cultivating and nourishing living faith in Christ and Christianity, it enforces blind acquiescence in its demands. Active, personal faith is supplanted by passive surrender to external power.

But the true test is the Christ idea. This is the matrix in which all true ideas respecting the Church are to be conceived.

The life and history of Christ in the flesh is the type and prophecy of the life and history of the Church in her militant state. His conception and birth typify her generation by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; His temptation in the wilderness typifies her warfare and conflict with the powers of darkness; His extreme sufferings and agony, her bloody persecutions and fiery trials; His death on the cross, her crucifixion of the flesh; His burial, her temporary subjection to the power of death; His resurrection, her ultimate perfect triumph over sin, death, Satan and hell; His ascension to the right hand of God, her immortality and perfect glorification. So also does His entire life in the flesh, developing itself from one stage and form of manifestation to another, from the manger to the cross, adumbrate the development and progress of the body mystical from one stage and form of existence to another, a living process going forward continually from the beginning to the end of her time state. Christ grew in stature from infancy to boyhood, from boyhood to youth, from youth to manhood. He at the same time *waxed strong* in spirit. He *increased* in wisdom, and in favor with God and man. He was not perfect, though sinless, in the beginning of His life, but was *made* perfect through sufferings, and thus *became* the Author of eternal salvation to them that obey Him.

Christ is the law of the Church. She has no life but that which flows from Him; and is governed by no law of existence other than that which He realized. The body cannot contradict the Head. If He, who is the Head, grew in stature, then by virtue of the internal and necessary connection between the Head and the mystical body, must the mystical body also *grow* in stature. Otherwise the body is not of one order with the Head. To affirm that the Church at once sprang full grown into existence by a transcendent act of divine omnipotence, is equivalent to denying that the Church is the Church of *Christ*. The affirmation resolves the Apostolic Church into the conception of a pagan myth—Minerva

springing completely armed from the brain of Jupiter. Instead of a reality, the mystical body is transformed into a fantastic image of the natural imagination.

Moreover, if the Head, being compassed with infirmity, offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save Him from death; if the Head, though a Son, *learned* obedience by the things which He suffered, and being thus made perfect, *became* the Author of eternal salvation; then also is the mystical Body, living according to the law of the same divine-human life, compassed with infirmity from its inception, and during its earthly history; then also does the Body not possess the fully articulated Faith, and does not possess perfect knowledge at birth, but must increase in wisdom, and increase in the knowledge of the Truth as well as in stature, from year to year with the onward flow of time; then also, must the Body, imperfect at first, be *made* perfect by the things which are suffered, and like the Head, only in the end become what He became, realizing perfectly in the glorified state the eternal salvation of which He is the Author. Otherwise, the Head would contradict the Body, and the Body would contradict the Head. There would be a schism; not a schism in the body mystical only, but a schism in the grand unity of the mystery of grace itself. The Body asserting a preter-Christian principle, and governed by a preter-Christian law of activity, would be divided against the Head. Divided thus, the Body, shaped by the plastic force of a foreign law, must form for itself a new, preter-Christian Head, claiming the possession of absolute rights received and held directly from Almighty God; and in this way, falsify the reality of the life of Jesus Christ in the flesh. The real Christ of the Apostolic Faith is then in effect volatilized into a Gnostic phantasm.

It follows that no one status of the existence of the mystical body, no one form of ecclesiastical organization, whatever relative necessity there may have been for it at any given period of her history, can be the norm of the Church for all time; just as no one stage of the life of Christ in the flesh

can be the ideal of Christ. To take, for example, the infancy of Christ, or the "Child Jesus," in the temple at the age of twelve years, or the Son of man enduring the bitter passion of the cross, either one fact by itself, as the *ideal* of the blessed Redeemer of the world, would give us a very one-sided and defective view of His life and work; and if this ideal were to regulate worship and mould our practical religious life, our worship could not be properly Christian, nor our religion healthy. Christ *Himself* only, is the ideal of faith; He, in the organic wholeness of His manifestation in the flesh, reaching from the manger to His mediatorial throne.

So also must the Church at any given period of her history, be only a partial manifestation of her life and mission. To take, for example, the Apostolic Church, or the Nicene period, or the papal organization as prevailing in the time of Pope Innocent III., or the Protestant Reformation, or the Greek ecclesiastical economy of Russia; to take any one of these, as the norm of the Christian Church, after which her doctrines, polity and worship are to be fashioned absolutely in every nation and country, and in every age of the world; to do this, would be to falsify catholicity, limit the spontaneous action of her life, and deny the power of free adaptation to the universal and ever-varying needs of mankind. Neither one can stand as the absolute law; for the Church is not externally related to any conception or fact, as the tabernacle of Moses was related to the pattern which God showed him in the Mount. Indeed there is no external pattern. Being a living organism, including in her constitution the natural as a factor no less than the supernatural, the Church is unlike any other existence, and is always more than she can realize at any given period of time. She carries her type in herself alone. That type is Christ, her living Head. And that type she can realize perfectly only in her own ultimate perfection. In the nature of the case, then, no ecclesiastical economy can challenge our faith absolutely. We must believe in the Church as having a beginning, and a real progress, as well as an ultimate end; whilst her objective faith, her ministry, and her sacraments are in themselves the same

amid all the convulsions and transformations through which it is her vocation to pass.

We proceed now to consider the point towards which all that we have thus far sought to unfold, has been converging, namely, the *idea of Church Authority*, the main question of your letter. The principle of the answer is already given. We will state this principle more fully, and then from it endeavor to develop, as concisely as we can, the nature of authority.

Christ the Revelation of Authority.

The true idea of *Authority* is given in *the personal life* of Jesus Christ. The authority with which He taught the truth, was absolute; and therefore, He challenged not merely thought and reflection, but *faith*, requiring an unreserved and full surrender, not to His will, nor to His doctrines, but to *Himself*. As He spake, no man had spoken before, and no man has spoken since. In what did His peculiar authority consist?

Christ taught with absolute authority, because He was, really and personally, the absolute Truth. "I am *the truth*." What He taught as truth, He did; and what He taught, He was. His claims and teachings were only the free utterance of His own personal fulness. He did not err in teaching, because there was no error or perverting force in Him; error had no root in His constitution; and in every conflict with error and moral evil, He rose superior to and overcame all the power of sin that wrought in the human nature which He assumed. He spake as never man spake, because there never was such a man.

The principle of error is sin. Sin in its activity is divisive and disorganizing; separating and rending asunder all the elements of unity. It divides man from God. Then, as a consequence, having found a lodgment in his personal existence, it works as a disorganizing force continuously in the entire man. Sin divides the body from the soul; sunders the feelings from the control of the understanding; the understanding from the intuitions of the reason; reason from the determinations of the will; and the freedom of the will from the law of

freedom in God. All His mighty powers fall upon and against one another. The activity of thought contradicts the demands of His concrete relations, and the idea and purpose of His creation. Hence men cannot but be fallible.

Men are wrong constitutionally; that is, they are wrong as now constituted in their purely natural, fallen condition. Hence they are predisposed to do wrong, and to think wrong, and to do it persistently. The opposite relation does not prevail. False volitions and false thinking do not determine the false life of men. But the motions of their false life produce false moral activities, and erroneous opinions and theories.

Christ was without sin. He was sinless. Not only sinless, but also positively perfect; that is, He was, whilst in the flesh, in the positive process of ultimate moral perfection. At every point, and at every moment of His life, He freely willed and did the will of His Father in heaven. He felt, thought, said and did what was right, and true, and good before God, without any taint of evil or admixture of error. Being thus, on the one hand, free from sin, and on the other, morally perfect, He was the infallible *Teacher* of the truth.

Christ did not possess the authority of an infallible teacher in virtue of His mediatorial office. There was no such office before the Mediator. The office was in God, but not abstractly; it was in Him potentially, in that the Son dwelt in the bosom of the Father. It was also in the primeval promise, but only in that the "seed" of the woman was the substance of the Promise. The mediatorial office became a reality in the Person of the Mediator. Better still; in that God assumed man into union with Himself in His Son and stood under the law, the Person of the Mediator became a reality, and in this personal mystery the mediatorial office became a reality also. With the historical fact of the incarnation, began the work of redemption from sin. No Mediator, no mediatorial office. The authority of the personal Truth is in order to the authority of official teaching. But we cannot affirm the converse. We cannot say: no mediatorial office, no Mediator. The authority of the Mediatorial office, considered extrinsically, is not in

order to the authority of the Mediator. The office of the Mediator comes to be real in and with the Mediator Himself.

Christ did not acquire His authority in consequence of any special communication made to Him from God. Considering this opinion from the stand-point of the Apostolic faith, we must maintain that no such communication was possible. Who is Christ? Is He not the *fulness* of the Godhead? Is He not the absolute *self*-communication of God in the person of His co-equal, co-eternal Son? Are not hid in Him *all* the treasures of wisdom and knowledge? Says our Lord: "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." Not *a* life, or a superior kind of life, but *life*, the absolute life. As the life of the Father is underived and absolutely original, so is the life of the Son. And this Son is Jesus of Nazareth. It is He, Jesus Christ, who has life *in Himself*. It is He who came forth from the Father. "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world." Than this veritable self-communication, anything higher, more real, more trustworthy, is inconceivable. The supposition of a gift of the Spirit, or of an extraordinary influence, from which He derived His authority, as of something different and outside of Himself, in effect denies the reality of the Incarnation, and reduces Jesus to the level of Moses or John the Baptist.

Being the life, He is the light of the world. "*I* am the light of the world." His words were the direct outflow from the fountain of truth, the manifestation in speech of what He was in Himself. Hence it came that He awoke in every susceptible heart, a profound sense of the authority with which He taught.

Much less may we suppose that He derived His authority from a divine commission, or an act of God conferring on Christ an extraordinary prerogative, a prerogative which, without this divine act, He would not have possessed. Such a commission would be external to Christ, something intermediate between Him and the Father. Any imagination of this sort is out and out incompatible with the constitution of the Person

of our Lord; and must fall to the ground as soon as we recognize the nature of the Truth which He claims to be Himself.

No commission, no communication from God, no office, no sacred deposit confided to Him to be delivered to His disciples, confers on Him authority to teach the truth infallibly to men; but His authority is grounded in the life, in the divine-human life, which by the new-creating energy of the Spirit has become a reality in His Person.

What did Christ teach? Primarily He taught Himself,—His own ineffable fulness. In teaching Himself He taught the entire macrocosm of grace. He taught the nature and attributes of God; but He did this in that He lived the life of God in the flesh. He taught the nature and relations of man; but He did this in that He lived the true, sinless, morally perfect life of man on earth in union and communion with God. He taught the character and power of sin, of guilt, and of death; but He did this in that He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, bore and expiated the guilt of sin by His sufferings, and destroyed death and him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, in His resurrection from the dead. He taught the infinite capacities and the immortality of man, but He did this in that He glorified humanity in His ascension to the right hand of God. He also taught the destruction of the world and the consummation of His kingdom. He did this prophetically, and He will do it really. He did it prophetically in that He actually overcame the world and perfected Himself in His glorification; and He will do it really and fully at His Second Coming, when His Church shall achieve the same victory over the world, over sin and death, and rejoice in the realization of the same ineffable glorification.

Thus is all the teaching of our Lord grounded in the sinless and positively holy life which He lived and perfected. His teaching in words, never stands apart from the substantive truth which He is and realizes. He is and does what He teaches. But more than this. The substantive truth revealed in His Person is infinitely more than the articulate utterance of it in propositions. What He says falls short of what He is.

His teaching is of necessity only a partial manifestation of the truth; and therefore possesses, relatively, less authority than His Person and life. Even of our Lord's own matchless oral utterances, when compared with the absolute truth which He has realized in His glorification, we can predicate infallibility only in a relative sense. No one, therefore, can know the true import of His words merely by studying His words, but only by the living communion of faith with Himself in the Spirit. And the knowledge of the believer can become more and more complete, only in the degree that this personal communion of life with Life approaches perfection.

Here then we have revealed to us in the personal life of Christ, the true idea of authority and authoritative Christian teaching. It includes three essential elements. Authority implies the presence of the objectively True. Authority prevails properly, not in the sphere of sense, but in the higher domain of Spirit. There is a necessary correlation of authority and freedom. These momenta I will take up consecutively.

Authority the Objectively True.

Authority is the living *Truth*, or the objectively True, in its relation to our moral and spiritual being. It is related to our being in its wholeness; not only to our natural ignorance of God, but also to the perverseness of sensual appetite, and particularly to the will,—to its native wickedness and want of positive aptitude for the good. In other words, authority is related to all the moral and spiritual needs of our fallen human life as a whole; and so related as to answer to them, meet and satisfy them in a real way. So related, authority evokes from the depths of the human spirit, the free, intuitive response of faith and obedience or, failing to do this, it provokes repulsion and antagonism, according to the peculiar susceptibility of the subject.

Absolute authority supposes the presence of the absolute Truth, or the absolute realization in personal life of the objectively True. Such authority apprehends the subject dynamically, and moves him to the ethical surrender of himself abso-

lutely to its infallible claims; or, failing to evoke the unreserved intuitive response of the subject, it puts him in the very act under condemnation, and convicts him of being a liar.

Such authority never existed, either in fact or in idea, until the Word was made flesh, in whom the absolute Truth became a living reality. The two-fold relation of the absolute authority of Christ is seen respectively in the spiritual attitude of the Apostle John and in that of the traitor Judas. Since then such authority has never existed in any community or person, for the simple reason that the fulness of Truth in Christ has never as yet been perfectly realized in actual human life. And in consequence the positive spiritual attitude of St. John and the negative spiritual attitude of Judas have never been absolutely repeated.

Relative authority supposes the presence of the Truth in a relative sense, or the partial realization of the infinite fulness of Christ. In the degree that the general life of the Church is positively holy and morally perfect does her true authority assert itself. In the degree that this general life is weak and defective does her authority recede and become comparatively outward only and formal. To assume that absolute authority may stand in Truth that is not absolute but only relative, or that it may stand in what, according to the economy of grace, can be no more than a partial realization of the glorified life of Christ, is both a logical and a spiritual contradiction. Hence, reflecting on the basis of the Christ-idea, we must lay it down as an axiomatic truth: no morally and spiritually perfected human life, no absolute authority. In a sphere where there is no moral life at all, there is no authority at all. Of the animal kingdom it is not to be predicated in any sense.

Relative authority can call forth only a partial response from the subject; and this, for the reason that it stands in a moral life that is true, indeed, in principle, but in fact is disorganized and perverted by the indwelling power of sin. The spiritual needs of the subject are met and satisfied only in part, and the self-surrender of the subject can therefore not be absolute, but must correspond to the relative character of the truth which

confronts him. When authority in itself only relative demands of the subject an absolute self-surrender, it violates the spiritual being of the subject instead of satisfying it. Then authority ceases to be *authority*, and becomes mere external power and tyranny.

Authority in the Domain of Spirit.

Christian authority prevails in the domain of *Spirit.* Though in the world, Christ was not of the world. He was not a man among natural men. Though truly human, He stood in a new order of spiritual existence; spiritual, we say, because conceived and anointed by the Holy Ghost. His sinless life, though assailed by all the powers of evil, was nourished by positive communion with God in the fellowship of the Spirit. He lived entirely above the order of the present sinful world. Though bone of our bones and flesh of our flesh, He had nothing whatever in common with corrupt human life. But filled with the Spirit, He lived His life consciously and freely in God.

Moving freely in the bosom of this spiritual domain, the Truth, which He was, stood in the life of the Spirit Himself; and the authority which He realized, was the absolute authority of Spirit. It was, therefore, in the deepest sense, internal, free, and unlimited, superseding all the natural limitations of the world.

His authority being spiritual, it operates through the medium of the Spirit, whom He has sent forth from the Father, thereby communicating to His people the supernatural powers of His own glorified life, and evoking the absolute response of spirit to Spirit.

No authority is absolute, which is not, like that of Christ, the free and full manifestation of the Spirit, not to sense, not to the power of assent, but to the human spirit,—touching its profoundest religious instincts, endowing it with noble capacities, raising it to a higher intelligence, and holding it in perpetual fellowship with Spirit by the force of a purely spiritual and spiritualizing bond.

Authority the Correlate of Freedom.

Authority is the *correlate of freedom.* There is no authority where there is no freedom, and there is no freedom where there is no authority. Authority is not superior outward power that forces the subject to succumb blindly to its behest. Such is the relation of man to the animal, over which he exercises a controlling influence and compels submission; or of a brutal father to a helpless child; but it is not the relation of Christ to His disciples, nor is it the legitimate relation of father to child.

Authority addressing the moral nature, does not only tolerate, but also requires the exercise of will. It necessitates the free, self-determining activity of the subject. In no other way can authority prevail, or accomplish its end. If the subject refuses to determine himself freely according to the truth which authority represents and maintains, then positive authority itself fails, and in relation to the given subject ceases to exist. In relation to the given subject, authority becomes external force.

In Christ the correlation of authority and freedom, was perfect. Being the substantive Truth, the truth of the Godhead and the truth of humanity in one personal existence, and as such wholly free from the disharmony and corruption of sin. He was invested with the highest moral and spiritual prerogatives of the Creator, and exercised the highest moral freedom of the creature. He commanded with the authority of God, and He obeyed both with the innocent simplicity of a pure childhood, and with the firm, inflexible, self-determining resolution of the noblest manhood. He was absolutely free in that He was absolutely True

Accordingly, the absolute authority of Christ supposes His absolute sinlessness. Any taint or motion of sin in His heart, would have destroyed the organic unity and harmony of His life and brought Him into a state of bondage to a false, foreign power. The loss of absolute freedom, or of the power of determining Himself absolutely by the activity of His own will according to the law of truth as such, would have been the

loss of absolute authority. Hence, before He lived there was no absolute authority among men; and for the reason that there was in no other man the absolute freedom from sin.

The absolute authority of Christ quickens freedom in His mystical body. That is to say, in the act of creating the Church by the coming and overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; He constituted a spiritual communion whose vocation and goal is the realization of His own perfect freedom. This freedom in the Spirit is alike the vocation of every member; and of no one less than of another, but of every one in his own sphere, according to the peculiar operation and gift of the Spirit. Now perfect freedom is the goal, not a present possession. Only in her complete deliverance from sin and the consummation of her life, can her vocation become a fully actualized fact.

As in the life of Christ, so in the history of the Church, authority and freedom are correlative. Authority conditions freedom, and freedom conditions authority. The exercise of spiritual authority quickens and promotes freedom; and the growth of spiritual freedom sustains and confirms authority. They can never be separated and held asunder, no more in the communion of the Church, than they were in the life of Christ. Both stand and live in Truth and in the Spirit. The separation falsifies and destroys them, the one as well as the other. Authority becomes mechanical power and despotism; and freedom becomes slavery or lawlessness.

Taking Christ as the ideal of authority, these *three* are essential elements. Authority stands in the living Truth. It is active in the communion of the Spirit. It is the necessary correlate of Freedom. These elements are reciprocally commensurate. None could prevail were either one wanting; and no one can prevail in more perfect measure than the others. They are but different aspects or forms of one divine-human life.

True Church Authority.

Like the authority revealed in the personal life of Jesus Christ, is all *true Church authority*. It is the same in kind; but it is of necessity less in degree.

The authority of the Church of Christ, if true, must be the same *in kind*. What is the Church but the *body* of Christ? What is His body but the sphere and organ of His living presence? What, but His mystical communion generated by and existing in the Spirit? What, but the fulness of *Christ*, as He is the fulness of God?

All the attributes and powers of the Church must therefore be of the same order, essentially, as those of her Head. Were they in any view essentially different, the Church would not be *His* body; would not be *His* fulness; would not be the organic continuation, in the Spirit, of His own life; but by such essential difference she would proclaim herself to be a perversion, or putrefaction, or a dead branch of the true Vine.

Being the mystical communion of the life of Christ, the authority of the Church, like His, stands in her life and truth. Not in that she has the truth, as outward doctrine or dogma, in her safe keeping, and has had it from the beginning, and hands it down mechanically and intact from age to age, (like an heir-loom in an ancient royal family, or a fossil relic), by means of a regular outward succession of a separate class of persons, who are put in charge of the truth; but in that she is the very life and the very truth herself. She is the substantial realization of the Truth, not in the way of definite, ultimate propositions, not in the way of external power or a given form of ecclesiastical government, but in the way of actual fact. She has the truth, not by virtue of some extraordinary extrinsic gift bestowed immediately by God and from God, but, as in the personal life of Christ, by virtue of the essential being of her spiritual organism. She *has* the truth in that she *is* the reality of the truth. She has the truth in the degree that she is the reality; and she has not the truth in the degree in which she is not the very reality of the truth.

The essential reality which the Church is, conditions the truth which she holds in the form of definite conscious apprehension and articulate utterance. Were she not in reality the mystical body of Christ, she could have no knowledge of this mystery and no true knowledge of Jesus Christ. So in the

case of any individual man. Were I not a personal human being I could have no knowledge of myself as a man, and no knowledge of humanity in general. In the nature of the case, however, the conscious self-apprehension of the Church can never transcend the reality. Just the contrary is the case. Her conscious self-apprehension is not even commensurate with what she really is; but always falls short of it. It may be compared to natural self-consciousness. The knowledge which men possess of humanity always falls short of the objective constitution of humanity. Man is to his understanding and judgment, an unfathomable, and therefore, an inexpressible mystery.

In this respect the articulate utterances of the Church are like those of Christ. As He in His life and work is infinitely more than the import of His words, so is the Church as she is in herself and in her concrete relations, immeasurably more than her definite conceptions of herself, and more than her dogmatic formulas. The plastic forces of her life are in consequence continually modifying and perfecting her knowledge. Whilst her knowledge and practical activity unquestionably react upon her life, yet it is the unfathomable mystery of her life, the substantive truth which is in process of realization, that moulds her knowledge and inspires her activity. The former always governs and complements the latter; never the reverse. Hence it comes that the truth which the Church *is* and *lives* in her history, is more authoritative for the individual conscience and more perfectly correlated to the freedom of the subject, than the truth which she articulates in dogmatic formulas. Imperfect as she is in her present militant state, yet her teaching is less perfect still than herself.

Whilst the authority is the same in kind as that of her Head, it is less *in degree*. The Church is indeed the fulness of Christ; but this fulness is potential, rather than actual. The perfect realization of her life is prospective. When Christ shall come again, she shall be glorified with Him. Then, and not before, will she reach the goal of her vocation and be perfected in the ultimate perfection of His redeeming work. In

that day, when Christ shall complete His own victory over the disorganizing power of death and Satan, then also will His mystical body surmount all imperfection and attain to the full actualization of the new life.

Being the living communion of Christ in the Spirit, the present imperfection of the Church pertains to her constitution as a whole. It affects in the same degree, every attribute and every function of the entire organism. It affects her unity, her holiness, her catholicity, her authority, and authoritative teaching. To suppose that one attribute may be perfectly realized, her unity for example, and not her holiness, contradicts the idea that she is the mystical *body* of Christ. She can actualize the attribute of unity only in the sense and in the degree that she actualizes the attribute of holiness. Sin being the ever-active principle of division, of internal disorder, confusion and general disorganization, there will and must be divisions and irregularities in the bosom of the Church just in the degree that the power of sin still prevails. Only as she advances in positive holiness; only as she is transformed more and more into the image and likeness of her sinless Lord and Head, can she become *one* in the sense of her Faith. Any unity not growing out of positive holiness, but brought about by some other power, is therefore only external, formal and hollow.

The Church being by the relation which she sustains backward to Pentecost and forward to the Second Advent of necessity imperfect morally and spiritually, her authority is of necessity imperfect also. She is not, like Christ, the absolute Truth; that is, she is not now the absolute realization of the Truth according to the law of her life. She does not live, as He did, in the Spirit, free from all the corruption of the flesh. For this reason she does not possess, nor can she exercise, the absolute authority of Christ. Were the Church perfectly holy, were she the actual realization of the fulness of Christ, then would her authority be absolute. But perverted by sin, which pervades every artery of her constitution, her authority can only be partial.

Inasmuch as her authority is but relative and partial, the Church does not evoke the absolute self-surrender of her members. And why? Because the spiritual, and moral, and intellectual needs of the subject, are not met absolutely and fully satisfied. Her members may, therefore, in the light of the objective Faith, question the perfection of a formula of authoritative teaching, or the validity of an ecclesiastical practice without, in the very act, falling under condemnation of the Truth and convicting themselves of a lie.

Here I must pause. My answer is much longer than I had expected or intended it to be; though I have been compressing as much as possible; and have been checking the outgrowth of branch thoughts at every node.

Your question involves the antithesis between the Roman Church and other branches of the Church Catholic; and throughout this Letter there is more or less direct reference to pending issues. But had I the time at command, I would pass on now, and consider the central idea, which I have been unfolding, in its negative bearings. The Roman position, viewed in the light of the absolute personal Truth, is to my mind clearly untenable. Authority in the sense that the Pope arrogates it to himself, cannot be predicated of any Apostle, nor of the entire Apostolic College. Nay more. I must go further, and maintain, that our blessed Lord and Saviour Himself, did not possess it. The Pope of Rome, as the pronounced Vicar of Christ, lays claim to a kind of authority that his acknowledged Lord did not possess in His state of humiliation on earth, and that He does not even now possess in His state of exaltation at the right hand of God. Christ's authority is not, like that claimed by the Pope, a power conferred upon Him externally by God. He does not exercise it in virtue of an office that is higher than He is personally. His authority is indeed absolute, and He is the infallible spiritual monarch in Heaven and on earth; but Christ holds this pre-eminence and exercises such infallible authority because He is Himself the infallible Person. Infallible authority cannot be the predicate of a fallible subject.

But I must waive the further prosecution of the subject, at least for the present.

Praying that God may strengthen you through the Spirit in the faith and knowledge of the Truth as it is in the Person and life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

E. V. GERHART.

Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., October 18th, 1871.

ART. III.—THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY MINISTRY VIEWED FROM THE STAND-POINT OF CHRIST'S ATONEMENT.*

2 COR. 5 : 18--20. *All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.*

IT is not a matter of indifference what views of Divine things we hold. Both truth and error are things of far-reaching consequences. Theory and practice, doctrine and character, faith and works, are more intimately connected, than many persons are willing to admit. They are united as body and soul are united; and act and re-act upon each other. It is not immaterial from what stand-point we look at truth. The only true stand-point, is the one which affords us a full and an all-sided view of a particular truth in all its relations to *the* truth. It matters much whether we view spiritual things by Reason *alone*, or by Reason *and* Faith. There is a difference between actually seeing things in the light, or trying to see them without light. Christianity together with all appertaining thereunto must be viewed, and can be seen only, in the

* A sermon preached at the meeting of the Mission Conference at Jonestown, Pa., 1871.

Light of Life, which is Christ. Christianity, like its Author, has two sides—it is *Divine and human.* Christ, the God-man, is the only source of Christianity. It is the continuation of His life and work in the world. Hence the Church, the Bible, the Holy Sacraments, the office of the Christian Ministry, the Christian Religion—the whole Kingdom of Grace—must partake of the life and character of Christ. They must all be Christian in a special sense, that is, *Christ-like, divine-human.* All must correspond with Him, who is the living centre of the entire system and plan of salvation. There must be unity and harmony in the economy of grace. It is therefore evident, in view of the supernatural character of Christianity, that unaided and unenlightened Reason cannot do justice to it, to its institutions, its ordinances and means; and that it cannot apprehend their full force and meaning. If it be viewed by Reason alone, it will appear human *only.* The low and one-sided views of everything distinctly Christian, which are so extensively prevalent now, are no doubt to be attributed to the absence of true faith. It is not Reason, but Faith that perceives the presence and power of realities, which lie beyond the range and reach of our senses, and above the boundaries of Reason. Low views of Christ, of the Church, of the Sacraments, of the Ministry, of Religion generally, betray a want of faith. There is no neutral ground between faith and unbelief; and hence every one must be either a believer, or an unbeliever. Christianity is one thing to an unbeliever, and an entirely different thing to a believer. To unbelief the Incarnation of Christ is the birth of an ordinary child; to faith it is the Son of God become the Son of man for the redemption of mankind. To unbelief Christ's crucifixion is a scene of mere bodily suffering; to faith it is the world-redeeming sacrifice for sin. To unbelief the Bible is a book which may be read and criticised like any other book; to faith it is the revelation of the mind and will of God addressed to the children of men in human language. To unbelief the Church is a human society on a level with other human societies; to faith it is a Divine Institution, for the conversion of

the world, and for the edification of God's people. To unbelief the Holy Sacraments are mere empty ceremonies; to faith they are means of grace—signs and seals of the new covenant. To unbelief religion is nothing but a code of law, and a system of duties; to faith it is a living union and communion with Christ, who saves man by sanctifying him. To unbelief the Christian Minister is the servant of the people without any official authority and power from God; to faith he is a servant of Christ, a steward of the mysteries of God, invested with official authority and power from God. As a general thing, low views of the Church, of the means of grace, and of the ministry, are the legitimate offspring of low views of Christ. They are parts of a system of religion which is not God-made, but man-made; of a system, in which man is the centre, and in which all that man does is considered the chief element in religion. Such unchurchly and unchristian views can do justice to neither side of religion; and must result in great practical mischief.

We shall confine our remarks to the Holy Office of the Christian Ministry; and in order to show you its nature and character in the true light, we shall view it from the standpoint of the Atonement of Christ. It is from this stand-point that the Apostle Paul views it in our text, when he calls the office itself, "*The ministry* of *reconciliation*," and the bearers of the office, "*Ambassadors* for *Christ*." We infer from these expressions of St. Paul that the office of the Christian Ministry is an office of great dignity, importance and responsibility —the highest and holiest office on earth. An earnest consideration of three things will make this evident:

I. *The official relation, in which the Christian Minister stands to God and man.*

II. *The official authority and power, with which he is invested.*

III. *The official mission and work, which are assigned to him.*

The first question that presents itself here is, In what relation does the Christian Minister stand to God and to his fel-

low-men? Is there anything peculiar in this relation? Does it differ from the common relation, which other Christians sustain to God and to their fellow-men? Is there anything in it, that belongs exclusively to him by virtue of his Holy office? St. Paul answers these questions, when he says, "We are ambassadors for Christ." An ambassador for Christ is a man sent by Christ to men on a special mission. As such he is by Christ's own appointment, His representative, who has special charge of His cause—speaks in His name—acts for Him by His authority, among those to whom he has been sent. As a representative of Christ, he comes to stand between God and the people—not to prevent them from coming to God through Christ, but to assist them to come in the only way appointed of God. That Christian Ministers stand in this representative relation to Christ, and that they speak and act in a representative capacity, we infer from the words of Christ and of St. Paul. Christ says, "He that receiveth you, receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me, receiveth him that sent Me." Again, "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me, despiseth him that sent Me." St. Paul says in our text, "Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

The representative character of the Christian Ministry appears furthermore from the nature of the work with which they are charged, and in which they are engaged. *Their* work is the work of Christ. Christ's work is a mediatorial and a remedial work; and is to be carried forward in the world by the Church, and especially by those in the Church, whom He has appointed and sent as ambassadors for Him. Now since the work of the Christian Ministry is the continuation of Christ's work, their work must necessarily partake more or less of a mediatorial and a remedial character. The work of Christ, however, is not, and is not to be, carried forward in the world in the sense of completing His work, as though He left it incomplete; for when He died on the cross, He said, "*It is*

finished." The work is to be carried forward by way of applying to men what has been procured for them by Him in the work of Redemption. The end of Christ's redemption is the salvation of men. To attain to salvation, men and God must be reconciled and re-united; men must be regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit, however, works by means—not indeed by *any and every means*, but by the means of God's own appointment—by the means of grace —the word and the sacraments. By the believing use of these means, God comes to men and men to God, because the grace which they communicate is redeeming, sanctifying and saving grace as it comes from God through Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and men. These means, again, are not to be dispensed by *any and every body*, but by the Lord's own ambassadors. Hence the necessity for the Holy office. The duty of dispensing the means of grace the Great Head of the Church has assigned to His ministers. They are to proclaim the gospel, to administer the sacraments, and to govern the people. To enable them to fulfil these several duties God has clothed them with the authority and the power of an office, which has a three-fold function;—it is prophetic, priestly and kingly. They are and must be *teachers, priests and pastors.* Now it is evident from the fact, that the Christian Ministers are charged with carrying forward the work of Christ in the world; and from the fact that they are to carry forward this work in the Church by the means of grace; they must stand, by virtue of their office, *between* God and the people. They are under God ministering in holy things unto the people.

The grace which these means convey, bring men to God, through Christ, by bringing God to men through Him. Now if the means of grace mediate in any sense between God and men through the only Mediator, the office of the Christian Ministry, besides being a prophetic and a kingly office, must be also a *priestly* office. If the Christian Ministers are actually ambassadors *for* Christ; if they really speak and act *in Christ's stead;* if they are the true representatives of Christ in the Church by virtue of their Holy office; they must not only be

teachers and pastors, but also *priests*. They minister to the people not only from the pulpit, but also at the altar. The priestly function of the Holy office is the only connecting link between the prophetic and the kingly functions; and without this the other two are ineffectual, so far as everlasting results are concerned. Without the priestly function the office of the ministry would be incomplete, and could not meet the wants which it was designed to meet. The Christian Ministers can, however, only be priests on the basis and strength of Christ's atonement. Their every official act must rest on this. They can only wield official influence and power by acting in the name of Him, who is the Mediator between God and men.

Many persons lift up their hands in holy horror, when the word priest is mentioned in connection with the Christian ministry. Why are they so shocked at this idea? Because they misunderstand the functions of the sacred office, and, especially the priestly. Through their prejudices they can only regard it as a deadly heresy. Ministers are not priests in the sense, in which Aaron and his successors were priests; but in a much higher sense. They are not priests in the sense, in which the Roman Catholic clergy pretend to be priests—for the sacrifice of Christ is complete once for all. They are not priests in the sense, in which Christ Himself was a priest; for he was the great and only High-priest, who "by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." They are priests in a peculiar and in a special sense; they are priests inasmuch as the ministry of reconciliation is committed to them; they are charged with the duty of dispensing the means of grace in the church, which are not only means of a general grace, but also, and *particularly*, of a special grace—of a grace, which is sanctifying and saving, because it is redeeming and reconciling—of the grace of God as it flows through Christ, and is dyed all over in His precious blood. Hence the saints in heaven are represented as those "who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Some men deny that any priestly functions belong to the office of the Christian Ministry, on the

ground that all Christians are priests; and that as such, they have a free and direct access to the throne of God without the intervention of any man. We admit that there is a universal priesthood of Christians, and that every Christian has access to God through the mediation of Jesus Christ. This universal priesthood of Christians, however, has its Divine limits, beyond which it cannot go without becoming a daring presumption. This free access to God has been put under Divine restrictions, beyond which it becomes disorderly. Many things the people can do, and ought to do, for themselves and for each other. There are, however, certain things which they cannot, and dare not, do for themselves and for others. There are some things which Christ alone can do for them, either Himself, or by those who have been authorized and empowered by Him for this purpose. Men shall not preach the gospel without a special Divine commission. Men are not to administer the Holy Sacraments without a special Divine authority. It is not right to perform official acts in an unofficial capacity; for this would be in conflict with the established order of God. St. Paul says, "God hath given to *us* the ministry of reconciliation." The same Apostle says, in another place, "Christ gave *some* apostles; and *some*, prophets; and *some*, evangelists; and *some*, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Now if all Christians, by virtue of the universal priesthood, have the *same* power and *equal* authority, the Bible contradicts itself; and there is no room for a ministry of reconciliation. Then the relation between pastor and people is entirely imaginary. The extreme view of the universal priesthood of Christians, strikes at the very root of the Christian ministry, and opens the flood-gates of sectarianism, and of infidelity.

We have now seen, that the very idea of the Christian ministry must carry with it the meaning and force of some kind of mediation between God and the people. The question presents itself here, how do men come to occupy this peculiar position? Who authorizes them to perform ministerial acts?

Who confers upon them the power of office? May any one be a minister who chooses to be one without asking leave of any body? Can any number of Christians choose and appoint to this holy office any one whom they please? "Men may be chosen and called to a particular office by their fellow-men, but the office itself can never be received in this way. The office with all its rights and powers, with all its duties and responsibilities comes to men from Christ" through the Church, who is the Head and the Lord of the Church, and as such has all power, both in heaven and on earth. This power to call and to ordain qualified and sanctified men to the holy office He has delegated to His Church. Is any one called to this office, he is called by Christ Himself through the Church. The mere fact that any one claims to be an ambassador for Christ, is no evidence, that the ministry of reconciliation is committed unto him. No pretensions and professions, no amount of talents or culture, no piety, however eminent, can confer the power of office. Something more is required. The candidate for the holy ministry must be ordained to the office by the Church, to which the Saviour has delegated authority and power for this and other purposes. No individual man, nor any number of men, can have this authority, except it be delegated to him, or to them, by a higher authority. Ordination is the solemn consecration of such as are called of God to the holy office by the laying on of hands; by which act they are actually invested with the very power of the office itself. The laying on of hands is a Divine act, by which God claims for Himself the man and his services. "To lay hands upon a thing is to say, *this is mine.* It is the placing upon the candidate for ordination the seal of ownership," the confirmation of a heavenly commission. God, however, does not claim an individual for a position, for a service, or for any office, to whom He does not impart grace to enable him to discharge its duties. Ordination is not an empty and a meaningless ceremony—it is not a mere form. Whenever God's authority is interwoven with any form or ceremony, it is more than something merely outward —there is in it and about it a fulness, a meaning and a force,

which make themselves felt as the grace and blessing of the Divine presence. But have we any Divine authority for the imposition of hands? We have the examples of Christ and His Apostles. We read that immediately before Christ ascended into heaven, "he lifted up his hands and blessed his disciples." The Apostles laid their hands upon the seven Deacons. When Barnabas and Saul were separated to the missionary work by the command of the Holy Ghost, they laid their hands on them, before they sent them away. Timothy is reminded of the fact that St. Paul and the Presbytery had laid their hands upon him, and he is bidden to lay hands "*suddenly*" upon no man. With Christ and His Apostles the laying on of hands was the medium through which something spiritual was communicated. This something is sometimes called *a gift, a grace, a blessing*, and sometimes the Holy Ghost. No man is truly a minister who is not solemnly ordained to the office by an authority higher than himself; just as no man can be an officer of the State, though elected or appointed, until he is sworn and inaugurated into office in a solemn and a public way.

The act of ordination places the candidate for the ministry into an official relation toward God and toward his fellow-men. The ordained minister, in his ministrations in holy things, does not act as an individual, "*from and for* himself, but as an officer, *from and for* Christ." His ministerial acts are not the acts of a mere individual—they are official acts. His work is an official work. There is a difference "between a man *as a man*, and a man *as an officer*, and between his work *as the work of a man*, and *as the work of an officer*." As an officer, a man is *more* than an individual—his official acts represent a mind and a will, which no unofficial acts of a mere individual can represent—and carry with them a weight, a force and an authority, which do not attach to acts performed in a *non*-official capacity. As a minister of Christ, he does not preach the gospel in his own name, but *in Christ's name;* he offers up prayers, thanks and praise *in Christ's name;* he administers the sacraments *in Christ's name;* he conducts the whole public worship *in Christ's name*. Whatever he does in the name, and

by the authority of Christ, "he does it *for* Christ, and *in His stead.*" His ministerial acts are the acts of Christ. He is an ambassador *for* Christ. Both ministers and congregations, whether consciously or unconsciously, continually act on this principle, that the man of God stands *officially* in a representative relation both to God and to the people. In the public ministrations of the sanctuary, the minister is *the official voice and organ of God*, through which the mind and will of God are proclaimed to the people; and *the official voice and organ of the congregation*, who brings before God, not his own individual prayers and offerings, but the united prayers and offerings of the *whole* congregation. The members of the Church want pastoral visits from time to time; they desire in times of sickness and affliction, the pastor's prayers, his ministrations of comfort and instruction; they wish him to teach them the way of God, and to be present at their funerals. Why, and how is this? Because he is a responsible officer of the Lord, an ambassador *for* Christ, who comes to them with authority. In his official capacity he represents the presence of Christ, and ministers to their spiritual wants in His name. No right-minded man will prefer the services of an irresponsible man to a regularly ordained minister, to administer to him counsel, instruction and comfort. There *is something* in the relation between pastor and people. Those who do not wish to know the mind, the will, and the way of the Lord, pass by the ambassador for Christ, and call in such as do not sustain this relation to them.

God puts certain men, whom He has chosen, qualified and sanctified, into official relations to Him and to the people by conferring upon them the authority and the power of the holy office, to perform an official work for Him. What is the particular mission of the Christian ministry? St. Paul says in our text, "God hath given to us the ministry of *reconciliation.*" "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, we pray you in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled to God.*" Reconciliation of man with God, and of God with man, is a central idea, which runs through the whole Bible—the objective point, which

Christ's work of redemption, and the Christian Church with its ministrations and means, are struggling and striving to realize. The former relation and communion between God and men, which was broken by sin, is to be restored again by a reconciliation on the basis of the atonement of Christ. It is on this basis alone, that a real and an everlasting peace between God and men can be established. Christ is the *only* mediator between God and men—the *only* way to a true peace and rest —the *only* source of life eternal. He is the Prince of peace, and His peace is "the peace of God, which passeth all understanding,"—a peace, "which the world can neither give nor take away." Man, to be saved, must come into a state of grace by being justified, regenerated, and sanctified. He must be a Christian, not in name only, but in *deed* also. To this end, he must be brought into a living contact with Divine grace—must be received into covenant relations with God—must be incorporated into the Christian Church—must come into union with Christ, and through Him, into communion with God, by a personal faith in the very personality of Christ. Now by what means is all this to be brought about? Undoubtedly by means of the ministry of reconciliation, which consists in the preaching of the holy gospel, and in the administration of the holy sacraments by those to whom this important trust has been committed. *God's work* must be accomplished by *God's means.* It is preposterous and ridiculous to suppose, that God would institute means of grace to our salvation, and then pass them by, and stoop down to those who are either too proud or too stubborn to use them; and save them in their own way, on their own terms, and by their own means, or without any means at all. He that would be saved must submit to God—God will not submit to him. God will condescend to man, but He cannot stoop to him. The Christian minister comes, then, on a peace-mission; in the spirit of peace; with a message of peace; with the means of peace; with signs and seals of peace. Peace is the aim and end of his ministry. He is to treat with men with a view to peace, in the name of the Prince of peace. The conditions of peace are an unconditional surrender, a free and a

full submission to God by faith in Christ, the Mediator between God and men. The proper work, then, of the Christian ministry is the carrying forward on earth the mediatorial work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by way of application, through the means of grace, the word and the sacraments. The grace, which these means convey, is of *a mediatorial and of a remedial* nature. It is the grace of God as it comes through Christ. It is in Christ, and through Christ, that it becomes a sanctifying and a saving grace; because in Him, and through Him, it has become a redeeming and a justifying grace. It is *sacramental* grace. The Divine means convey a life-giving and a life-sustaining power, which comes from the person of Christ. The great saving power is after all in Christ; the means are only for the purpose of conveying and of applying this power to men for their salvation. The word and the sacraments are full of Christ. The grace which they convey must be received and appropriated by faith. It is by faith alone, that man can lay hold of the saving power of Christ; and it is through faith alone, that the power of Christ becomes saving. So long as a man stands aloof from the Christian Church, and does not use the means of grace; so long as he does not believe in Christ, he is a rebel still; whatever else he may profess to be, or appear to be. He is still bent on having his own will and way. Piety outside of the Christian Church, and independent of the means of grace; cannot be anything else but *a Christless, a graceless, a lifeless, a faithless, and a fruitless* piety. It cannot be real, but apparent *only*. If the Church is really the body of Christ, as St. Paul says it is, it must be so—it cannot be otherwise. There are no such things as a true Christian life, a true Christian growth, a true Christian nurture, and a true Christian activity of individuals altogether independent of the organic life, of the organic growth, of the organic nurture, and of the organic activity of the Church as the body of Christ. An individual man can only live, grow, act and be fed in union with the church. He must be a *living part of the living whole*. One thing is very much overlooked and forgotten at present, viz.: that the Church and Christian-

ity are *organic*, and not mechanical. Hence we find that the view is prevalent far and wide, that Christianity must come anew and directly from heaven for each individual. This is a great error. Christianity is in the world, and has been in the world, ever since the Incarnation of Christ. Through His work it assumed a particular character. When He died on the Cross, it did not die with Him. When He ascended into heaven He did not take it with Him, but He left it behind as a spiritual leaven, which is to leaven, until it has leavened the whole lump. Christ's life and power have come down to us through the Church, and are still in the world, and at work in it. If any one wishes to become a Christian, he can only be made such by this old and historical Christianity in the Church, and not by a new and direct Christianity from heaven. True Christianity is self-propagating. It propagates itself by seed, like every other kind of life. This seed-power and seed-life is imparted and implanted by God's means. The man of God is, then, under Christ, a sower, who sows the seed of a new life.

This view is often misrepresented, and is charged with formalism, by those who know no better. The charge is false. The real formalists are they who put the Church on a level with human societies, and who explain away Christ and grace from the sacraments, and yet continue to use them as empty forms, or reject them altogether. We invariably find that they who attach no value to God's institutions, ordinances and means, substitute in their stead something else, something human, something of their own; and thus they fall into the worst kind of formalism, into a formalism which cuts off all communion with the throne of grace.

In conclusion we would draw from the whole subject a few practical inferences.

If ministers are what, St. Paul says, they are, it is evident that the regular public worship of the sanctuary must carry with it more weight and power than any private worship—that it is necessary in addition to all private worship; and that, consequently, vacant congregations must suffer much, because they are a flock without a shepherd.

If ministers are what St. Paul represents them to be, how careful ought they to be in regard to what they say and do, lest they be found misrepresenting Him who sent them, and lest they be found injuring the cause of their Master. If they are co-workers with God, they ought to plant and to water, and expect, and pray for, the increase from God, whose the work is.

If ministers are really ambassadors for Christ, how careful ought the people to be how they treat them, lest they be found laying their hands on the Lord's anointed, and incur God's displeasure. The fold ought to obey him who has the rule over them, and not tear down what he builds up.

May the Great Head of the Church everywhere bless the ministry of reconciliation to the salvation of many souls, until the great and blessed reign of peace shall be established, when Christ shall be "all and in all." *Amen.*

Art. IV.—PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY.

A History of Philosophy from Thales to the present time. By Dr. Friedrich Ueberweg, late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Konigsberg. Translated from the Fourth German Edition. By George S. Morris, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Michigan. With additions by Noah Porter, D.D., LL. D., President of Yale College. With a Preface by the Editors (Henry B. Smith, D.D., and Philip Schaff, D.D.,) Professors in the Union Theological Seminary. New York. Vol. 1.—History of the Ancient and Mediæval Philosophy. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1872.

We regard the work of Dr. Ueberweg, entitled A History of Philosophy from Thales to the present time, as in every way worthy of an extended notice. The subject is one of great interest in itself, and of still greater interest when considered in its relation to the history of Christianity. Every thing that pertains to man's history is being sought after with great avidity in this age. It is reasonable, then, that a work purporting to trace the history of the highest efforts of the human intellect should arrest careful attention.

Ueberweg distinguishes the conception of philosophy viewed historically, from the conception of mental development in general, and that of scientific culture in particular, while at the same time it is related to these as an outgrowth from them. He includes philosophy under the generic notion of science, but distinguishes it from other sciences by the specific difference, that it is not occupied like each of them, with any special, limited province of things, nor yet with the sum of these provinces taken in their full extent, but with the nature, laws and connection of what actually is. As he defines it, "philosophy is the science of principles." With this agrees substantially the definition given by Schwegler, when he says, "Philosophy examines the totality of experience in the form of an organized system in harmony with the laws of thought." Hegel defines philosophy as "the science of the absolute in the form of dialectical development, or, the science of the self-comprehending reason."

The author, however, occupies but little space in discussing the prolegomena of his subject. After giving this brief definition of philosophy, then one similarly brief of history, accompanying these, however, with ample and pertinent notes, he goes forward at once with his work, leaving the student to gather what the history of philosophy is rather by his work itself, than attempting to give him beforehand a full comprehension of the subject, which would be impossible. In this we think there is somewhat to commend in Ueberweg, although, at first, one who comes to his book to find out at the beginning what the author's views in regard to the history of philosophy are, instead of the history itself, may be a little disappointed. No full or exhaustive definition of a science can be imparted to the mind of a student before he has studied the science itself. Lengthy prolegomena, like long introductions to sermons, for the mind of the student, move very much in the dark, while they are likely also to anticipate what is repeated in a better form in the body of the work. We endorse Horace's maxim as applicable here no less than to poets,

> Semper ad eventum festinat, et in medias res
> . . . auditorem rapit. . . .

Yet we who write about the history of philosophy, and not the history itself, may imitate the example of this same Horace when he wrote on the art of poetry, and be allowed to stop a moment to prosecute our inquiry while the author goes on his way.

Has philosophy a history? What are its general divisions, and on what principles are they made?

That philosophy has a history we may conclude, since it moves in the sphere of intelligence as unfolded in time. It is closely allied with history in general, which, according to Ueberweg's brief definition, "is the process by which nature and spirit are developed." It is indeed a department of history, and yet stands out from the ordinary departments of history somewhat as philosophy stands out from other sciences. The philosophy of history has to do with the general principles according to which the life of the world unfolds itself, while the history of philosophy has for its object, to trace and explain the world's own reflection upon its life, as related to itself and to the supersensible world, throughout the different eras of its history. The difference is like that between the real explanation of a man's life, and his own consciousness or apprehension of his life. Yet the philosophy that prevails in a given age may not be fully identified with the general consciousness of that age, for, as Ueberweg remarks, "it rather rises above the general consciousness through the power of independent thought generating and developing new germs, and anticipating in theory the essential character of development yet to come." Thus Plato, while belonging to the ancient Greek nation, by the inspiration of genius grasped germs of thought which enter into the heart-centre of philosophy for all time. The alliance of philosophy with history in general, however, is sufficient to impart to it a real historical character.

Ueberweg endorses, as most successful, the attempt of the Hegelian philosophy to characterize the great periods in the life of humanity, but thinks, according to what we have said above, that there must be some distinction drawn when we come to consider the periods in the history of philosophy. Schwegler,

also, while endorsing the general theory of Hegel, that there is to be found a constant order or law of development in the philosophic systems, grounded in the striving of the spirit ever to raise itself to a higher point of consciousness and knowledge, and to recognize the whole spiritual and natural universe more and more as the mirror of itself, yet thinks that Hegel applied his theory in a way that would destroy the freedom of human actions, and remove the very conception of contingency, *i. e.*, that any thing should be contrary to reason.

Instead of seeking a rigid correspondence between the succession of systems of philosophy, and the succession of logical categories in the system of logic, Ueberweg employs the more free and usual method of dividing the history of philosophy into two general periods: 1. The Philosophy of Antiquity, and 2. The Philosophy of the Christian Era. In this latter period he has the divisions of the Patristic philosophy and the Scholastic, leaving the post-Reformation, or modern philosophy, to be treated in the second volume, which has not yet made its appearance in this country.

The general character of the human mind in ante-Christian, and particularly in Hellenic antiquity, may be described as its comparatively unreflecting belief in its own harmony and of its oneness with nature. The sense of an opposition, as existing either among its own different functions and interests, or between the mind and nature, and as needing reconciliation, is as yet relatively undeveloped. The philosophy of antiquity, like that of every period, partakes necessarily, in what concerns its chronological beginnings and its permanent basis, of the character of the period to which it belongs, while at the same time it tends, at least in its general and most fundamental direction, upward and beyond the level of the period, and so prepares the way for the transition to new and higher stages.

The beginnings of philosophy are found, not among the peoples of the North, who were eminent for strength and courage, but devoid of culture, nor among the Orientals, who, though susceptible of the elements of higher culture, were content simply to retain them in a spirit of passive resignation,—but among

the Hellenes, who harmoniously combined the characteristics of both. The author, therefore, gives but little space to Oriental theosophic speculation, and passes on at once to Grecian philosophy. This he divides as follows: 1st Period. Prevailing direction of philosophical inquiry toward the universe of nature, or predominance of Cosmology, from Thales to Anaxagoras and the Atomists. 2. Prevailing direction of philosophical inquiry toward man, as a willing and thinking being, or predominance of ethics and logic, accompanied, however, by the gradual resumption and a growing encouragement of natural philosophy, from the Sophists to the Stoics, Epicureans and Skeptics. 3. Prevailing direction of philosophical inquiry to the subject of the divine nature, and the relation of the world and man to it, predominance of theosophy, from Neo-Pythagoreanism till the exit of ancient philosophy in the Neo-Platonic school. These periods are again subdivided, as the author moves forward in his analysis of the complicated process, presenting a masterly and lucid arrangement of material that lets in a flood of light for the classical scholar upon authors whom he learns to know now from a new stand-point.

It may seem strange to include the teachings of our Saviour and His Apostles in a history of philosophy; yet our author, with a full recognition of the supernatural character of Christianity, proceeds in a very interesting way to consider the germs of philosophic thought presented in these teachings, as related to Judaism and heathenism. His remarks, in this way, upon the writings of the Apostles, and his notes on the influence of Judaism and heathenism on the peculiar type which Christianity assumed in the Roman Catholic Church are of a highly instructive character. He then passes on to the history of Patristic philosophy, extending from the time of the Apostles to Charlemagne, and divides it into two sections, separated by the Council of Nice (A. D. 325). The first section includes the time of the genesis of the fundamental dogmas, when philosophical and theological speculation was inseparably interwoven. The second covers the period of the further development of the doctrines of the Church on the basis of the fundamental dogmas

already established, in which period philosophy, being used to justify these dogmas, and co-operating in the further development of new ones, begins to assume a character of independence with reference to the dogmatic teaching of the Church.

The next period is that of the Scholastic philosophy, to the history of which the author devotes the remainder of his first volume.

"Scholasticism was philosophy in the service of established and accepted theological doctrines, or, at least in such subordination to them, that, where philosophy and theology trod on common ground, the latter was received as the absolute norm and criterion of truth. More particularly, scholasticism was the reproduction of ancient philosophy under the control of ecclesiastical doctrine, with an accommodation, in cases of discrepancy between them, of the former to the latter. Its divisions are: 1) the commencement of Scholasticism, or the accommodation of the Aristotelian logic and of Neo-Platonic philosophemes to the doctrine of the Church, from John Scotus Erigena to the Amalricans, or from the ninth till the beginning of the thirteenth century; 2) the complete development and widest extension of Scholasticism, or the combination of the Aristotelian philosophy, which had now become fully known, to the dogmas of the Church—from Alexander of Hales to the close of the Middle Ages, the revival of classical studies, the commencement of the investigation of nature and the division of the Church."

Philosophy during the period of Scholasticism does not attain an independent character. It came into service necessarily in settling the *theology* of the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, just as it had served its purpose in settling the form of *dogmas* during the Patristic period. There can be no theology without philosophy, for philosophy is that which gives form to the contents of theology for thought. The great questions around which scholastic philosophy revolves were, the relation of thought to being, faith to reason, subject to object. It did not succeed in escaping the dualism which prevailed in the apprehension of Christianity generally during this period,

and struggling with it, Scholasticism in the end gave way to the new era for philosophy that dawned with the Protestant Reformation.

Scholastic philosophy moved in the sphere of logic rather than speculation. Hence it was not productive. Logic never discovered any thing new. It moves in a circle, and its office is to unfold and explain what is already given. The study of it sharpens the powers of the reasoning faculty, but does not enlarge the realm of thought. It makes clear what is given and known, but it does not reach out into the unknown. Logic, without scientific research or philosophic speculation, dwarfs the mind, and its processes in the end become a mere system of intellectual gymnastics. Such we may say was the fate, to a large extent, of Scholasticism. Yet logic can never be studied entirely by itself. In the wars of logical formulas during the Middle Ages there was also an under-current of deep philosophy, aspirations for something higher and better. Scotus Erigena already reveals a sense of the necessary harmony of reason and Christianity. All through there were intimations of a deep sense of the fundamental problems of philosophy. But like the Church of the mediæval period it could not get beyond itself into a new and higher freedom.

So far we follow the author, and we would be glad to have the second volume before us as a guide in what we have yet to say in the way of preparation for some reflections on the general subject of the relation of philosophy to Christianity.

In passing to a consideration of the course of Modern philosophy we at once feel that it moves in a different spirit and starts from a different stand-point. It moves out of the merely logical into the scientific and speculative. It goes out in search after material which had been left to lie unknown, and seeks in a more independent way to build up a system of its own.

The prevailingly scientific direction which philosophical inquiry took after the Reformation appears in the Baconian method of induction, which has been so highly applauded by many in later times as the only true philosophic method. We can hardly call Bacon's a philosophy at all, and so far as it

pretends to be a philosophy it becomes false. In this view it led to the sensationalism and shallow empiricism of Locke, and afterwards to Deism in England and infidelity in France. Yet we may allow that it accomplished a great deal in stimulating inquiry after facts, and furnished material, without which science and philosophy must ever become lean and weak. Bacon represented the general spirit of inquiry, invention and discovery, in the age which shook off the nightmare of Scholasticism, as well as the pedagogic tutelage of the Mediæval Church.

As Christianity and Scholasticism moved together during the Middle Ages, so also Protestantism and philosophy have sustained an intimate relation to each other since the Reformation. The new foundation on which philosophy builds in the modern age, seems at first to create a breach between itself and theology. With Descartes commences a new and independent movement in philosophy. It leaves the paternal and fostering care of theology, under which it had exercised its youthful powers, and seeks to work in a realm of its own. Does it thereby reject its only safe guide, and launch upon a sea, to be driven without compass or helm upon the rocks and shoals of dark infidelity? We shall see.

Philosophy has a sphere and a work of its own, which is not just the same as that of theology, and when set free by the general movement of history in the sixteenth century it sought to find this sphere and perform this work. In attempting to walk alone it did indeed wander into many dangers, and often tottered and fell. But it returned from its wanderings, and sought to stand again.

At the Reformation there was a general sundering of the two orders or spheres, the natural and the supernatural, science and religion, Church and State; but a sundering only in order to come together again in a higher freedom. As an illustration of this we may take the relation of Church and State, a problem which wrought with such immense power during the Middle Ages, and which formed one of the elements of the Reformation itself. We may allow that the Church is above the State, as

Roman Catholic theologians argue, that the authority of the Kingdom of Christ should be submitted to as supreme. But just because the two orders, the natural and the supernatural, the religious and the secular, are not yet brought together, but stand apart in the life of the world, the Church may not anticipate, and use arbitrary and tyrannical power over the State, as was done during the shameful feuds of the Middle Ages. The civil power chafed and fretted and rebelled because it was held under the power of the Church in an unfree way, while on the other hand, when it obtained the power it in return sought to enslave the Church; as for instance, when Philip of France carried the Pope and his court to Avignon. In modern times, Church and State tend to separation, securing to each a more independent sphere of action, but only in order that they may seek each other again, and maintain mutually friendly relations. It does not affect the truth of this statement, that after the Reformation the Church passed under the power of the State, because that was only a temporary reaction. Any one who reads the course of history can easily see a great difference in modern times, and under Protestant influence, in regard to this matter. This will serve to illustrate what we mean when we say that philosophy after the Reformation sought to build on its own foundations, and to stand independent of theology or the dogmas of the Church. Reason and revelation come from the same God; nature and the supernatural are alike from Him. Hence they will be found to possess an internal and necessary unity, and require to come together in a free way. The secular and the spiritual orders must in the end come together, but they cannot be forced together before they are prepared for the union.

Accordingly modern philosophy started in an attempt to find a basis of its own. The *cogito, ergo sum*, of Descartes was the first. He was followed by Genlincx and Malebranche. Then came Spinoza and Leibnitz, afterwards Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, those men of giant powers, whose systems form links in the chain of modern history. It is not our purpose now to follow these systems in order to read the steps in their progress.

This would, indeed, be an interesting theme, but we postpone it until we may have occasion to return to it, should our time allow, when the second volume of Ueberweg makes its appearance.

We propose now to follow out some reflections on the relation of philosophy to Christianity, which we have placed as the subject of this article.

It is not difficult to see this relation in one of its phases in the two periods of the philosophy of the Christian era already noticed. As Rome had already prepared the forms of constitutional and governmental powers, and Greece a rich and versatile language for Christianity when it appeared, so also Grecian philosophy furnished material in its developed forms of thought and reasoning to clothe the new and mysterious dogmas of the Church. The skilled metaphysical acumen of the Eastern Church led the way in settling forms of expression for the doctrine of God according to His revelation in Christ. The fierce contests through which the Church passed in maintaining, settling, and defining, the dogma of the person of Christ, and of the Holy Trinity, reveal at every stage the immense service which Christianity derived from heathen philosophy. The substance given was, indeed, a supernatural revelation. Grecian philosophy could contribute nothing here. But this substance of revelation required to be clothed in human forms of speech, just as the Eternal Logos took upon Him our flesh. Not only language was required, but philosophic language. Christ, as the absolute Truth, came to answer and satisfy the profoundest speculations of the profoundest minds the world has ever produced, in regard to absolute being, the divine nature, the personality of God, and man's relation to Him. It was just on these great subjects that the greatest philosophers of antiquity had exercised themselves; and now, just as the Christian Church turned heathen temples into Christian temples, so she also turned these profound speculations to account in defining the Christian dogmas. We need to refer only to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds to show how the Church brought into its service the keenest analysis, the greatest pre-

cision, and the most significant terminology which Greek philosophy had developed. And when, having settled its creeds and defined its dogmas, the Church moved forward to produce its systematic theologies,—those magnificent creations of the Middle Ages, towering in beauty like their grand cathedrals, the dialectics of Aristotle and the philosophy of Plato, and Neo Platonism, again became the necessary instrument. The theological treatises of such masters as Anselm and Thomas Aquinas bear evidence on every page of the aid rendered by philosophy in setting forth the theology of the Church. It was just on account of the important office which philosophy performed in the service of theology that discussion ran high on the nature of this philosophy itself. This is what gave significance to the strife between Nominalism and Realism, a strife which is not ended even in our own day. The contest stood closely connected with most important questions in theology, questions relating to the Trinity, to original sin, &c. We notice that in his recently published theology, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, takes up the question, considering it necessary to sustain Nominalism and reject Realism, in order to make way for his theory of the *federal* headship, over against the *generic* headship of Adam.* And yet in the same volume he pronounces a sweeping judgment against the latest and best German the-

---

* Systematic Theology, Vol. 2, page 55, et seq. "The doctrine (of Realism) is a mere philosophical hypothesis. The hypothesis finds no support from consciousness. It is inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture." The last objection, we should suppose, would be the only one Dr. Hodge would consider it necessary and proper to urge; for when he presents the others he is introducing a philosophical theory of his own, which is contrary to his assertions in regard to the use of philosophy in a system of theology. He would have to rule out as false the very best theology of the Middle Ages, which opposed Nominalism just because it came in conflict with the doctrine of the Trinity, necessitating a theory of three Gods, instead of one in three persons. And yet, strangely enough, Dr. Hodge enters now as one of the objections to Realism, that it destroys the conception of one God. In adopting Nominalism and repudiating Realism, in his explanation of the nature of man, he is just as really calling in a philosophical theory to explain the sense of the Bible as the most philosophical Realist; for the Bible certainly does not teach either the one theory or the other in a formal, scientific way. To say that Nominalism agrees with the teaching of Scripture, and that Realism does not, is a mere assumption.

ology because it has so much to do with philosophy.* While, therefore, we now grow weary of the interminable syllogistic formulas of Scholastic argumentation, yet no one can fail to see the necessary relation their philosophy held to their theology.

The relation of philosophy to theology in modern times, as already intimated, is somewhat different. Yet the fortunes of the two are so interlinked that they cannot remain apart. The influence of the sensational philosophy of England was paralyzing on her church life and theology; in France it ran into the general infidelity and revolution. Philosophy had gone wrong, and its blighting influence was felt on the Church. In Germany the philosophy of Kant, while it squelched once for all the empiricism of Locke and the skepticism of Hume, and brought back a basis of certain knowledge, a *που στω*, in the mind itself, yet in shutting out the possibility of knowing the objective world, or the infinite, it tended necessarily to subjective idealism as developed in Fichte, and favored rationalism. Germany, thus, also had her aufklärung in the rationalism of the last half of the eighteenth century. But German philosophy burst through the shell that had thus been made to bound our finite existence and shut out the objective and the infinite. In the *philosophy of the absolute*, as it is called, a movement started by which the mechanical method of relating the supernatural to man, abstract supernaturalism, was superceded, and

---

* Systematic Theology Vol. 2, page 452. "This mediating theology, as it is called in Germany, is confessedly an attempt to combine the conclusions of modern speculation with Christian doctrine, or rather with Christianity. It is an attempt to mix incongruous elements which refuse to enter into combination. The mediating theology does not pretend to be founded on the Bible." And in condemnation of this theology, which is taught by such men as Ullman, Dorner, Olshausen, Lange, and others, he quotes, as his leading authority and help, Schwarz, who himself opposes this theology from the rationalist stand-point. Even Strauss and Bauer are called in to assist in the same work. The school of mediating theology in Germany, doubtless, has its faults, but it certainly may claim to be the best which Germany in this age has produced, and the very general acceptance given to their interpretation of the Bible, in such Commentaries as Olshausen's and Lange's, edited in the English translation by Dr. Schaff, would seem to bespeak for them a somewhat less wholesale condemnation than Princeton, through its venerable and respected theologian, here pronounces.

a most earnest effort was made to conceive of their relation as not heterogeneous. If the infinite is revealed to man in Christianity, and he is enabled by divine grace to apprehend the revelation, there must be also a power in the reason to conceive the infinite, at least to hold it in as a necessary idea, otherwise faith and reason, revelation and science, can have no reconciliation, and must necessarily be arrayed against each other and exclude each other. The struggle in philosophy here moved parallel with the mighty struggle in theology against such assaults as were made by the Tübingen school of rationalism, and both together gained the ascendency.

It is easy to see that the last great systems, or creations, of German philosophy have their faults. It is not difficult to set its whole history down as a mere succession of great errors, as is done so coolly and self-complacently in the last number of the *Catholic World*. Deism followed the Reformation; then came the pantheism of Spinoza, followed in due time by the Nihilism of Hegel. The alternative is then presented: the Catholic Church or Nihilism. It is easy in this way to browbeat philosophy with mere dogmatism, but the Roman Church settles no problem in this way. All that it can do is to set the supernatural over against the natural, revelation against science, the Church against the State and civilization. Protestantism stands in close sympathy with the historic currents of the world's life, and moves towards an inward reconciliation of the problem of the relation of the supernatural and the natural, while Romanism rests satisfied with merely asserting the supremacy of the one over the other, without the power of freely moulding and governing it. Hence that church feels itself called to array itself against the science and civilization of the nineteenth century, instead of seeking to mould and direct it.

The great movements of modern philosophy stand in the bosom of Protestant history. The Roman Catholic Church can point to no names of men, whose philosophic systems have so vitally related themselves with science and politics, with the heart currents of modern history, as those we have been referring to, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel. Why is this? They

produce philosophic talent and learning in the bosom of their church of quite as high an order as any in the Protestant Church. Only prejudice will deny this; but their philosophy comes to no independent standing. It is a scientific exposition of dogmas, a philosophical theology. Just here, doubtless, they would take issue with us. A philosophy that sets up for itself independent of revelation is an infidel philosophy. Protestantism alone, in denying the supernatural, can consistently produce such systems; but they are systems, not of truth, but of error. Thus the argument runs, we know. It is the argument reiterated in pretty much every philosophic article of the Catholic World. It sounds plausible. There are some Protestant theologians who, singularly enough, fall in with it, and repeat it substantially from their stand-point. They are those who, like Dr. Hodge, for instance, relate the Bible to Christianity, much as the Romanist relates his church to Christianity. They write Bible theology as the Romanist writes Church theology. For them a philosophical dogmatic, *philosophische dogmatik*, such as the Germans are familiar with, are beyond their comprehension, as Dr. Hodge confesses with reference to Lange's work of this character.* Bibliolatry among Protestants here comes to the same thing at last as ecclesiolatry among Romanists. In each case the supernatural and the natural come to no true inward union, but remain heterogeneous. The Romanist destroys the natural, as in the sacrament, where the natural substance is displaced by the supernatural, and the pseudo-Protestant allows of no possibility of a real union of the two. Both alike rule out all proper independent standing of science and philosophy, and deny the recognition of any free inward harmony between these and Christianity. The one condemns a Galileo because his science contradicts the dictum of the Church; the other condemns the system of a Hegel because it does not square with the Bible.

But must not a philosophy that attempts to build up a system

* Systematic Theology, Vol. II., page 731. "Lange's Commentaries are for the most part intelligible enough, but his *Philosophische Dogmatik*, none but a German, native or naturalized, can understand."

on reason be an infidel system? Is not Christianity the highest reason? And ought not philosophy, therefore, start from the facts of revelation? We answer, that, to do that would be to lose itself in theology. Philosophy and theology are not the same. Each has its appropriate sphere. To make revelation the basis of philosophy would be much the same as to make the Bible the basis for the science of astronomy. Christianity is a supernatural revelation in the form of life, but in reaching the natural it does not destroy the natural, nor take the place of the natural, but infuses into it a new life. The type of this relation is presented in the union of the two natures in the person of Christ. The presence of the divine left the human perfectly human and perfectly free. The human, as the form of the presence of the divine, retained its own normal character. The faculties of the human mind in Christ unfolded in a human way, while at the same time they were filled more and more, as they developed, by the presence of the divine. In the same way in the coming together of the two orders, the natural and the supernatural, the one is not lost in the other in the process. Philosophy, therefore, must start from its own stand-point in the reason, and not assume its stand-point, as theology does, in revelation. It has to do with man, the social order, the universe, in the natural order. This is a reasonable order, and from God, as revelation is from God, and the supernatural could not accomplish its purpose if the natural order were given up, or failed to develop in its own sphere. Christianity, for instance, can accomplish more for the world, as things now are, where the State maintains its own organization, and improves and develops legitimately, than it could were the State to dissolve and hand the work over to the Church. In that case, the first thing the Church would have to do would be to set to work organizing a state, as something embodying a function of the world's natural ethical life,—in other words it would have to restore the former condition again before it could do its proper work.

To bring out more clearly what we mean, take the specific philosophical sciences. There is Psychology. It requires a

study and a development of its own. The Church cannot take it out of its proper sphere, and teach it from the Bible. Neither can it so teach logic, nor Æsthetics, nor Ethics, nor social science in any of its departments. The Christian revelation had no such end in view. The Bible was not intended to teach science. Where it necessarily uses science, or refers to it, it does so, not to teach new scientific truth, but it refers to it in the stage of progress or development it may have attained at any given time. We may hold that the inspired writers were kept from endorsing any essential or positive error. Yet from such passages as that in which it is said the sun and the moon were commanded to stand still, it is apparent how freely the writers used the current views and opinions. They could not have done otherwise without being unnatural and unintelligible. Much of the labored effort to get out of the Bible systems of science, therefore, is a failure. It may be questioned, indeed, whether a scientific Biblical Psychology, such as that which Delitzsch has attempted, can be made completely systematic or scientific. And the reason lies just in what we have said, viz.: that Christianity comes as a new life to regenerate and sanctify the natural order *in its own forms of existence.* It does not bring new faculties to the mind, or new organs for society, but seeks to make the world new, while it still remains the world.

But as the natural is not destroyed in this process of renewal, but only sanctified and glorified, so also its forms of development are not destroyed. These forms of development constitute a part of the essence of the natural. They are related to it as form to contents. Hence art, science, social life, must develop according to their natural, normal order, while yet they are to come into union with the supernatural.

Thus far we are only claiming for the natural order a certain independence which the supernatural cannot interfere with without destroying it. How the two come together is not just now the point under consideration. Roman Catholicism interferes with this proper independence from theory, as it always tends to enslave the State. The theocratic view of the State

which has obtained currency in some Protestant countries also displaces the proper natural stand-point of the State.

Now, what we claim for philosophy is, a free development in its own sphere, while at the same time it should always be pervaded by a Christian spirit. But to become Christian it must not lose its identity, it must not give up its own stand-point as philosophy, for in that case it would cease to be philosophy, and Christianity in coming to mould it would have lost the natural material upon which to exert its elevating and saving power. Of course, there is always peril here, as there is for science, and human life in general. Philosophy may fall under the power of error, and become skeptical, or pantheistic; but the evil cannot be remedied by depriving it of the exercise of its own peculiar functions,—to think for itself.

Modern philosophy has exhibited strange and startling aberrations. It has stranded on the shoals of skepticism; has been drawn into the gulf of pantheism; has dreamed in subjective idealism, and bowed before a mere projection of itself in objective idealism. It has followed its speculations on being to the blank abyss of Nihilism. But we cannot regard all this as labor lost. So, too, nations have gone through similar experiences of imperfection and error in seeking a true constitution and form of existence. But history is not, on this account, a mere phantasmagoria. Each one of the great minds in the history of modern philosophy from Descartes to Hegel has produced that which is of vast service in the philosophical thinking of the present day. We retain the gold and cast away the dross.

Systematic, or scientific, theology, as distinguished from merely biblical theology, will necessarily take shape and form from the system of philosophy in which we stand. It cannot be otherwise. Philosophical thinking is just as necessary in apprehending Christianity as a scientific system, as human language is to present it as intelligible. We have seen how this was the case in the theological systems of the Middle Ages. It is no less the case in the modern age. Those who persuade themselves that they teach and write theology independently of all philosophical systems, only delude themselves. As well

might they assert that they write and teach it without language. Suppose they do, in this way, set aside the speculations of modern German philosophy, does it follow that they are, therefore, free from all systems? Will they take instead the English or Scotch? Will they take Locke instead of Kant? Or, Sir William Hamilton instead of Fichte or Hegel? Still they are using philosophy for the purpose of putting into form for thought the contents of their theology. And if they take no one of these, still they must have a system of their own, which will not likely be richer and better for refusing at least the help which those great minds are able to afford.

We cannot escape the alternative here presented by seeking to take refuge in the Bible. The Bible itself, inspired as it is, and possessed of supernatural contents, as to its human form, utters its message through the categories of human thought and reason. But it is not designed to be in any scientific order, whereas theology, if it is to be systematic, seeks a scientific order. It is only by conceding this, and making account of it, that theology can become progressive. And in this progress, while its contents remain the same, it continually takes more intelligible and satisfactory forms. For this we are indebted to the progress of philosophic thought.

What is sometimes urged as an objection to certain systems of theology, *that they are speculative*, is just their best recommendation. True, their speculations must be those of a believing mind, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and they must subject themselves to the inspired Word, but with these conditions work legitimately after fuller and higher apprehensions of the infinite truth of revelation.

What we have said here is true of all departments of theological science. It is only necessary to consider what progress has been made in the department of Church History, as an instance, to confirm this remark. History in its objective sense is written in the past, and cannot be changed. But the subjective schemes or theories according to which it is presented in recorded histories, are continually changing. Since the new course pursued by Neander, the father of modern Church his-

tory, a new impetus has been given to this science, and new interest attracted to it. Science here co-operates with revelation. A correct knowledge of the conception of history as such is regarded as necessary in order to give a proper representation of the history of the Church. And the progress made in bringing out this conception is due largely to what may be regarded as speculation. History, as a whole, has its underlying scheme. It is not an arbitrary unfolding of the world's life; but while it makes full room for man's free agency, it is nevertheless moulded and directed by fixed principles. To apprehend these principles is to get at the secret of history, and this must be reached by the same power of genius which everywhere leads the way in discovering and apprehending new and unknown principles. Can the Church historian ignore the help afforded him in this way by the progress of speculative thought? We think not.

The same is true also of systematic divinity. Here also new methods are employed, according to which the matter of revelation takes more intelligible form. Indeed, just because of the exalted character of the truths with which it has to do, is there room for the highest kind of speculation. During the Middle Ages there were certain subjects of theology that were ruled out of the sphere of human reason and human speculation. But in the progress of time these subjects were reduced in number. At one time it was thought that the Holy Trinity was such a subject, which had no connecting links with the order of creation, or human consciousness, and therefore must be treated as a subject of pure revelation. But we find now that the subject is regarded in a different light. If God exists essentially as Trinity in Unity, there will necessarily be projected shadows of His nature in His works, and in man. And if man is created in His image, shall we refuse to seek for a figure of the Trinity in man, and in the laws of human thought? Every where in the effort of modern science to penetrate the secret of nature, we find more and more the reflections of the triune nature of the Great Creator. Who shall say that Schelling's speculations here, according to which he regarded the whole

creation as a three-fold movement—going out from God, coming to a self-poise, and then a return to God—and the details according to which his grand speculation was carried out, is all lost labor, a mere idle fancy? Here, indeed, the revelation wrought in revealing new light for science. And thus always there is a mutual interworking between the two.

This is a sphere of freedom which modern theology is entering, which cannot fail to work out great results for the interests of the Church. Even the most staid and conservative theologians, who look with jealousy upon the freedom of German theology, are coming to adopt, in part at least, their methods. In America we are still fettered, as German theologians charge with truth, more than we should be, by the strictly drawn lines of our numerous denominations and sects. But theology is already beginning to break through these restraints. We are learning to appreciate and use the truth, wherever found, not asking first whether it can be made to square in every particular with one denomination or sect.

There should, indeed, be allowed to theology here a freedom which we cannot always accord to Creeds and Confessions of Faith. These Confessions are the careful, deliberative statements of the form of faith for a denomination. They cannot pretend to be of absolute authority, they are not inspired, yet they speak often for ages, and not until the Church has fully ripened for an advance, should they be tampered with. But it is one of the provinces of theological science to lead the way, according to the progress of apprehending Christianity, so that the confessions may eventually approach each other in more complete statements of the one common faith. We refer here, not of course to such œcumenical Creeds as embody in sum the whole Christian faith of the entire Church. But no Protestant denomination, we think, can claim such universal character and œcumenical authority for its particular Catechism or Confession. Lest we may be misunderstood, we add also, that in the exercise of proper freedom, no church teacher may disregard the obligation under which he stands to the Confession of his Church.

Our subject naturally suggests some thoughts, also, upon the

relation of the progress of science to Christianity. The present age is, perhaps, more distinguished for its scientific research than for its interest in pure philosophy. And this will be noted in the future history of philosophy. It is natural that it should be so. A philosophic age is most likely to be followed by one giving attention to science and practical life. In this way the one age, we may say, prepares material for the other. Philosophy needs the aid of science in order that it may be provided with material for its work; and science needs philosophy in order that it may be provided with principles for its use. We cannot regard it as a retrograde movement—that the present age, perhaps more than any preceding age, is turned in a practically scientific direction. The age of profound speculators gives way to the laborious scientists. And, as a consequence, the old antithesis now presents itself between science and religion. But here, again, the antithesis works inwardly towards a synthesis. No one who believes that the same God is the author of the natural and the supernatural creations, can fear any ultimate and unresolvable contradictions between the two.

It is true, that science in the hands of unbelievers may be arrayed in warfare against Christianity. But we must not say, on this account, that science as such is inimical to revelation, nor reject the aids she furnishes, in the way of material, for a fuller intellectual comprehension of revelation. Biblical interpretation itself has received vast aid from the progress of science. Philology, history, astronomy, geology, have all contributed their part. And as science advances we may expect new aid. Neither is it to be wondered at that science, in pursuing its own career, will often find itself in apparent antagonism with revelation. This arises from two causes. In the first place, science is necessarily progressive. It has had to correct many of its own conclusions. What is regarded as a true theory in one age, is liable to be supplemented or even overthrown in a subsequent age. This should teach scientific men not to be dogmatic in their statements, but to remember that they are investigators, not absolute masters, of truth. But the same is true also of revelation. In one view it is complete. In Jesus Christ

we have the absolute truth, and in His Word an infallible record. But the apprehension of the revelation, and the interpretation of the record, are not concluded for all time, but are progressive also. While, for the great purposes of salvation, the revelation may be sufficiently apprehended at all times, yet for the purposes of scientific apprehension it has also its stages of progress. Theologians may not, therefore, condemn unconditionally every theory of science which seems for the time to conflict with their apprehension of revealed truth. Neither can they afford to ignore the researches of science. The two should mutually assist each other. Science needs the light of revelation to illumine its pathway, because the true meaning of the natural creation can only be understood in the light of the supernatural creation, in which latter the former is to reach its proper end. But it does not follow from this that he who is guided by the light of revealed truth can dispense with the aid of science.

We have said, that the present scientific age is furnishing material for the progress of philosophy. One of the dangers to which science is exposed at such a time lies just in this, that it is disposed to refuse the aid of philosophy, in which all its work must seek to understand itself. And in the same way philosophy, the queen among sciences, the *scientia* scientiarum, must seek also to be guided in its pathway through unknown realms by the light that comes from above. This light must come from Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, Jesus Christ, the Alpha and Omega of the whole creation of God.

Art. V.—MEETING OF THE EXTREMES.

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, A. M., IRWIN, PA.

Man is prone both in thought and in action to run into extremes. This tendency is a result of the perversion of his nature by the fall in Eden. Righteousness has come to him, it is true, in the person of Jesus Christ the Lord, but that righteousness, though perfect and complete in itself, is given him to be worked out in his own being by supernatural means in a natural way. The Church, in which these means are found, is the body of Christ and the home of the Spirit, and yet the Church is in a sense left in his hands without any further direct revelations from heaven in the way of vision, dream, angel or prophetic inspiration. There is nothing visible to guide him but the Bible, and that Bible is made to be the authority for the most contradictory views and practices.

In this state of things we need not wonder if we find the Church inclined to run into extremes. It has done so in the past, it is doing so now. Perhaps this is the only natural way, owing to the presence of sin, in which it can come to reach the truth. One extreme begets another. The extremes then meet in what will be evident to all as a common and mischievous error. The result must ultimately be the apprehension of the truth in its purity, as the golden mean between what is extreme on the one side and what is extreme on the other. At the proper juncture, men are raised up in the providence of God, in whose personal life, including both thought and feeling, the truth comes to be a living reality, by which they become the root of the future, as they are the offspring of the past. This is one way, no doubt, in which the Holy Spirit unerringly guides the Church, not suffering the gates of hell to prevail against it, and will bring it gradually to the full apprehension in the end of the whole truth as it is in Jesus.

It is to be observed, however, in this connection, that truth is not by any means a compromise between two errors. What we mean to assert is, that all and every truth has its two sides, and you may approach it, or go out from it, at one or the other. By so doing you will necessarily lose sight of one side of the truth more and more the further you go on, and, though at first starting in the truth, land at last in positive error. Here you may find another man who set out at the other side and went around the other way, but meets you at the end in the same ditch. If it is too late for you both now to retrace your steps, others at least coming after you may take warning by your fate, and learn to lay hold of both sides in their proper relation to each other and as forming a whole in their living union.

We have said that the Church has had such experience in the past, and is having it now. Take for instance the doctrine of the person of our Lord. It was the Jews, who as children of the Old Covenant were the first received into the bosom of the New, that soon began to emphasize the human nature of our Saviour, until at last they ignored His divine nature altogether. It was the Gentile converts principally that started out in the opposite direction, and by making everything of the divine side, changed the human nature into a mere phantom or delusion. And thus Ebionite and Docetist together fell into the common ditch of that spirit of antichrist that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. Men like Irenæus, fathers of the Church, were raised up to combat these errors, and maintain the true divinity and true humanity of Christ. And when, at a later period, the question came up concerning the true relation of these two natures, one party started out at the side of their distinction, another at the side of their union. The one party soon fell into the error of a distinct separation of the two natures, admitting only a junction between them; while the other party fell into as grievous an error, by confounding the natures and teaching the absorption of the human by the divine, so that in the end both Nestorian and Eutychean met together in denying the inward necessary connection of

the two integral natures. The Church was thereby enabled to come to a clearer apprehension of the whole truth, and to proclaim the true doctrine of two natures in one person.

Such was the case also with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost were acknowledged from the beginning, as we have them in the Apostles' creed. But when men began to reflect on the Divine Being as thus revealed, they began also to emphasize, some the *unity* of Father, Son, and Spirit, and others the *distinction* between them. Those who set out at the side of the unity finally landed in the heresy of regarding the appellations Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as only so many different manifestations and names of one and the same Divine Being, while those who set out at the side of the distinction landed in the opposite heresy of considering the Son as subordinate to the Father and created by Him, until Sabellians and Arians met together on the common plain of denying the eternal being of the Son, and of the Spirit. Athanasius and others were raised up, by whom the Church came to lay hold of the true doctrine, unity of essence and distinction of person.

Other examples, in like manner, from the early history of the Church might be adduced, but our object is more particularly to show that in these modern times the extremes are meeting in the apprehension of Christianity in general, as well as of its specific doctrines and rites.

Christ Jesus is Himself the head of the new creation. The Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is given to make men new creatures in Him, and thus members of His mystical body. It is by this operation of the Spirit, who dwells both in Him and in them, that His mystical body, which is the Church, comes to be. Now as men become new creatures both as to their *life* and their *feeling*, the church through whose divinely appointed means the work is accomplished, may be looked at on two different sides; on the one side, as a body made up of those who have received a new life, and on the other, as made up of those who are renewed in feeling. Whosoever keeps the two sides in view and directs his steps

accordingly, is the one that apprehends the truth in its wholeness.

But unfortunately the life side began in process of time to overshadow the other side. "The idea of the Church became confounded with its external manifestation." The sacraments came to be the prominent means of grace, and outward submission to them was considered sufficient without regard to that transformation of the whole man into the image of Christ which was divinely intended to result from their use. Those who were authorized to administer them were denominated priests, and finally, as the Roman hierarchy came to be identical with the Church itself, submission to them was submission to the Church, and the watchword was, only by the Church to Christ. Men were regarded as Christians, who were merely baptized and aided by their presence from time to time in the offering up of the bloodless sacrifice on the altar. When they indulged in sin, they needed only to acknowledge the same in the confessional, and, by a word, or by undergoing some simple penance, they were absolved. When they died with the guilt of sins yet unforgiven, their spirits entered only into purgatory, from the pains and penalties of which they could still be saved by the offering up of the sacrifice on the altar in their behalf brought about through their surviving friends.

Such was the extreme to which the Church had come at the time of the Reformation, and the extensive sale of indulgences under the management of Tetzel was only a practical and tangible outcrop of its real inward state. By this occasion the spirit of Luther was aroused, and reaction in favor of the other side vigorously set in. The great battle cry now was, justification by faith, and the Bible. Men were taught that there must be a personal apprehension of the new life presented and offered in the Sacraments, by laying hold thereof and demonstrating its presence in thought, and feeling, and action. But now the tendency was to lose sight of the other side. This was the case, not so much with the Reformers themselves as with some who came after them, and they had frequent occasion even in their own day to repress the fanaticism of

those who would break down all sacraments and all Church authority.

And how is it in our own day after a period of over three hundred years? What are the views and practices of a large part of Protestantism? The objective or life side of religion is utterly lost sight of. The sacraments have nothing to do with the communication of the life of Christ; they are only helpers to think about Him. The preaching of the Gospel is the means by which the only life that is recognized, a sort of animated feeling, is imparted; and the sacraments are appendices for the same purpose acting only in a somewhat different manner. Ministers of the Gospel are nothing more than "preachers," the idea of the "kingly" being well-nigh forgotten, and the "priestly," if not wholly set aside, at least cried down. All that is needed is that men *feel* that they are saved, and they *are* saved. Christianity is regarded as being a system of feeling, and the watchword is, by Christ to the Church.

Here now the extreme is reached, and comes up face to face to the other. The point of meeting is the common ground of *ignoring the substantial in religion.* They meet at this point but come to it from opposite directions, the one by the way of the tangible outward sign, the other by the way of the intangible inward feeling. They both lose sight of the fact that religion is flesh and blood, not in their corrupt state, but the flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, now perfected and glorified, of which every man must eat and drink who wants to live and to live forever. The one fails to acknowledge the presence of that flesh and blood because reliant on the outward element without the necessary work-producing faith, and the other because reliant on faith as a mere feeling without the necessary divinely appointed outward element. Is not this the spirit of anti-christ, whereof we have heard that it should come, and even now is already in the world, in effect denying that Jesus Christ is come in the *flesh?*

The extreme may not be reached indeed by every individual of either party, whether in the papal or the Protestant ranks,

and therefore not by the party as a whole; and further, their respective creeds may be more faithful to the starting point than their lives now are, but that there are many in whose history or personal life the very extremes as described have been actualized, there can be no doubt. And if actualized only in some instances, the serious question must arise whether they are not legitimate fruits of the system itself, and whether there is not danger of the whole party drifting to the same end, if time long enough be given, and there be no arresting providence.

Perhaps these tendencies will not be arrested until the whole church comes to apprehend, as some parts thereof already do to a great extent, that the truth lies between these two extremes, in such a way as to embrace both sides, not in their extremes, but as they were in the beginning in their organic union. Irenæus, who stood above the point where the two sides began to diverge, could say not only, "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God," but also, "Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church." In his own life, if not in his intellectual apprehension, the two maxims became one. But the Church in these latter days, by virtue of the experience it has had and is now having, is coming, and will yet more fully come, to the possession and enjoyment of the same truth, both in its faith and in its knowledge. Men become members of the Church, and recipients of the Spirit by one and the same act. By a personal laying hold of the grace or life thus made present do they come by degrees to the full image of the second Adam. Without the presence of objective meat and drink, their faith would have nothing substantial to feed upon; without feeding by faith upon the food that is present, they could not possibly be personally benefited. So that while one extreme may say, "By the Church to Christ," and the other, "By Christ to the Church," the truth declares, we come at one and the same moment, in the sacramental transaction, both to Christ and His Church. We are ingrafted into Christ and are ipso facto members of His body, the Church; and now by taking up into ourselves His blessed life, ever presented to us from time to time

at His table, we become more and more like Him in all our ways. Is not this Christianity? Have we not here the true idea of the Church?

If from this general view we now descend to particulars we will find the extremes meeting each other in the same way. Take up first the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We have here the outward signs, bread and wine, and the inward grace, the body and blood of Christ. "The *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the *body* of Christ; the *cup* of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the *blood* of Christ?" So the Church received it at the beginning. But gradually the outward sign began to be magnified until at length it came to be the whole thing itself. The bread and wine, or in fact the bread alone, has become the very body and blood, the soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and is therefore a proper object of worship, whilst at the same time it is received into the mouth, masticated, and digested in the stomach. Through the body to the spirit is Christ communicated, and that which is born of the Spirit is nourished by that which is born of the flesh. It is no wonder that there was a reaction in favor of the other side, the inward invisible grace. Once more it came to be declared that the inward and the outward are distinct and separate, and yet sacramentally united. But soon from the Eutychean whirlpool of confusion, men began to dash against the Nestorian rocks of utter disruption. In too many cases this latter extreme has been actually reached. The body and blood of Christ are received now as well anywhere else as at His table by an inward exercise of feeling, meditation and prayer, the only specific difference when surrounding that table being the aid for meditation derived from the sight of bread broken and wine poured out.

Here the two extremes meet together in *ignoring the real spiritual presence of Christ.* The one regards Him as present *corporeally*, the other *mentally.* They both deny the objective operation of the Holy Ghost mediating the life of Christ, the one by regarding Him as already present under the form of bread, the other by regarding Him present in the way of thought and meditation.

The truth recognizes the presence of both the outward and the inward in their proper relation to each other. The bread and wine are there, and the body and blood of Christ are there. The one, which is visible, is the sign and seal of the presence of the other, which is invisible. The one is from the earth, material; the other is from heaven, spiritual; now brought together by the Holy Spirit, neither confounded together, nor sundered from each other, but joined together then and there in the case of every communicant who has the capacity of reception. Faith is necessary, the presence of Christ in a real way is necessary, and thus we have and hold the truth that underlies the two errors with that which is erroneous in both eliminated.

So also take up the subject of Church authority and individual freedom. Both were acknowledged in the beginning. "If any man neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." The Bereans "searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Therefore many of them believed." The former principle was the first to run into the extreme. In mediæval times the church was a great outward power, holding kings and kingdoms under its sway. It also claimed and exerted unlimited control over the faith and practices of its people. What was once proclaimed as the teaching of the Church, in a solemn assembly of the hierarchy, could not but be received implicitly by every member of the Church on pain of anathema and excommunication. Differing views may have prevailed, for instance, with regard to the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, prior to the year of grace 1854, but since the definition of that dogma at that time, bishop, priest, and people are bound to surrender their own private opinions on the subject, or the inevitable anathemas will fall upon their heads. And it is a noticeable fact, that this error has reached its extreme only in these last times. For it is now defined that infallibility resides in the person of the Pope himself, as the vicar of Christ, and successor of St. Peter. Had the Reformation, occasioned by the sale of indulgences, not taken place in the sixteenth century, it would

have burst forth now in the nineteenth; the promulgation of papal infallibility would have been the spark, and Doellinger and Hyacinthe might have been the Luther and Zwingli to fan it into a flame.

But re-action against this one-sided development of church authority had set in before this extreme had been reached. The Reformation did not originate from any purpose of this kind, yet the Reformers, in protesting against other errors, were necessarily brought into the position of setting up their own views in opposition to the teachings of the Church at that time. The ninety-five theses were an expression of Luther's own opinion as over against the voice of the general body. It was the same case with Zwingli, when he began to preach in Switzerland the doctrines of the Gospel as he understood them. It was not their design, however, to utterly ignore the voice of the Church, but rather to give their own view as to what its true utterances were. They appealed to the Church as she expressed her faith through the fathers, and in the œcumenical creeds. But when the door was thus partly opened from the very necessities of the case, others coming behind them threw it wide open, by declaring that every man has the right to go directly to the Bible itself, and judge for himself what it teaches, and get his Christianity and his Church fresh from its sacred pages, without caring to know how its meaning and power have been developed in the life of the Church from its beginning on the day of Pentecost on to their own day. The doctrine of "private judgment," as it is called, is held up everywhere as the precious inheritance of every individual, no matter whether it be the source or not of countless sects and endless confusion. It is astonishing to see how the two opposite errors come together just here at this point, *the authority of a single man.* The one has a pope for every man, the other makes every man a pope; but both alike ignore the Church as a body, living, growing, developing, and regard the whole truth as embodied in the brain of a single individual. As remarked before, the former error has just quite lately reached its extreme in the promulgation of the infallibility of the Pope, and surely now one would be

led to think, that the church will soon be induced, by the meeting of these errors face to face, to slough them both off, and see the truth as it lies between.

For we may even at this early date begin to see the force of the fact that the Church as a body advances from age to age, and brings out the truth clearer and clearer in a living way as time goes on. The Bible is its pole-star, by the guidance of which it must always sail from coast to coast. The individual must be a member of the body, and re-produce in himself the life of the whole; must know what has been held, and taught, having been brought out by many a hard conflict; and must thus as a part of the Church be prepared in a free way to take up and deal with all that is revealed in the Bible. An enlightened free submission to the Church as a living body and with the Bible in her hands seems to be at this present period the standing-point to be desired. If the teachings of the Church are not apprehended in this free way, without compulsion, they are nothing worth. They cannot benefit the man, as he has been divinely constituted, because they cannot possibly be taken up into his inner life and become part of his being. You can lead a horse to the water, but you cannot make him drink. The Pope would bring a man up to the dogma of the Virgin's immaculate conception, and force him to accept. The Church, as it is in the Pope's hands, was not particular enough in that instance, as in others also, to steer its course under the guidance of the polar-star, and therefore the man, though as submissive as possible to the Church as it has existed from the beginning on to the present, is unable theoretically to yield in this case and order his life accordingly. Private judgment, on the other hand, standing alone as a drop out of the current, cannot furnish a trough with water enough in it to satisfy a man when he would like to drink. It declares, as one instance, among many, that the doctrine of the union of divinity and humanity in the one person of our Lord Jesus Christ is an absurdity. If this were the case, how would the stream of life from God to man ever come to flow in its present fullness? Vaccination is a preventive discovered for a loath-

some disease. It is accepted and practiced by the medical world. The government may act the pope and compel every man to receive into his system the vaccine virus on pain of expatriation. Or, every enlightened citizen may freely, of his own accord, submit, and render himself free from the danger of contagion. Private judgment cares not a farthing for the knowledge and experience of the whole medical world, and, waiting until it can itself understand and explain how scabs from the teats of a cow can prevent disease, waits perhaps until it is too late to save the man from death.

The respect which posterity is naturally inclined to show towards those by whom great things were accomplished for the Church, is also another thing that is apt to run into extremes. Their works and words, or the benefits thereof, are handed down from generation to generation, and they themselves are properly held in grateful remembrance by all that come after them. But grateful remembrance gradually developed into worship, and by showing too great reverence for the creature, men began to obscure, at least in a practical way, the glory due to the Creator alone. Prayers were offered to Peter, Paul, John, and other saints, who did so much in their day for the Church of all ages. The Virgin Mary especially, the mother of Him who is the life of the world, is honored and revered as the Queen of heaven, the immaculate one who was assumed up into glory, and who has as many days in the calendar set apart for her service as her divine Son.

From this extreme the Reformers suddenly broke loose. But in doing so they came to be themselves, unintentionally on their part, substituted by their followers in the places of Mary and the Apostles. Martin Luther is in the eyes of some an object of regard next to the Divine Master Himself. He is the second saviour of the world. So to others is Calvin, or Knox, or Wesley, and on to the end of the list. Their word is law, from which there is no appeal. What the Reformers said and did must be accepted without hesitation, abatement, or correction. That man is considered untrue to the Reformation and to Protestantism who attempts to call into question or gainsay

anything that was done in the sixteenth century. This is clearly an extreme, and meets the other on the common ground of exalting and magnifying the importance of the human agents at the expense of the ultimate object which is divinely brought about by such instrumentality. The Virgin Mary is blessed among women, but must fade into the back-ground in the Church as she does in the Scriptures, in comparison with the fruit of her womb, Jesus, the Saviour, the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Peter, and Paul, and James, and John are truly great because of the great things they were enabled to do in their day for the Church, but it is true again that the work is more important than the instrument. Such also were the great and good men that followed them. Such also were Luther, and Zwingli, and Melancthon, and Calvin, and Ursinus. These men, in their several periods, were raised up by God that by them and in them the Personal Life that was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary might flow on in the world a continuous perpetual stream. They are but stones, living stones, built upon Jesus Christ, the chief corner-stone. But suppose we were to stop at them—stop, to honor and revere them—stop, either to pray to them, or appeal to them as absolutely perfect in themselves for all time—stop at them, instead of ourselves getting into the current in which they in common are, instead of becoming stones in the building in which they are but stones, how could the stream of life continue to flow on in us and by us for our own good and the good of those who come after us; how could the building ever rise until it would be ready on the resurrection morn for the topmost stone? "Worship God," said the angel to John, "for I am but thy *fellow-servant*, and of thy *brethren*, the prophets, and *of them which keep the sayings* of this book." The Virgin Mary might also say, "Worship not me, but Him who is *my* Saviour as well as thine," and Luther might say, "Worship me not, but take the truth from my hands as it was divinely put therein, fold it not up in a napkin, store it not away in a band-box, but let it be a living thing to thee as it has been to me, by developing its power and freeing it from any errors that may in the progress of the Church be discovered to remain."

Faith and works are, as it appears from the history of the Church, difficult things to be kept in their proper relation to each other. On the one side or the other, men are inclined to run into extremes. Even Luther, although a conservative on other points, was so far inclined to a one-sided view of his ruling principle, justification by faith, as at least to pronounce the Epistle of St. James, in which a justification by works is spoken of, an epistle of straw.

In the idea of *supererogation* works have reached their extreme error, and in the modern idea of so-called *entire sanctification* faith is reaching out towards its extreme. By the one error we are taught that we can do more good works than are necessary for our own justification, which can then be stored up and dealt out to others as needed. By the other we are taught that we can by our faith reach the same position of complete justification for ourselves at least if not for others. The two extremes meet in practically setting aside the satisfaction of Christ—shutting Him out from view, the one by the cloud of works, the other by the cloud of feeling. The truth is, that faith and works are not to be sundered. Jesus is our all-sufficient Saviour, and for His sake God accepts us, and re-creates us after His blessed image, bringing us nearer and nearer to it, while divine mercy requires on our part such an assured confiding in Him as will show itself in a growing life of obedience.

The extremes show themselves very palpably in the matter of public worship. We have seen how the celebration of the Holy Communion passed over into the offering up of the unbloody sacrifice on the altar. This transaction governed the whole idea of divine worship. He who offered the sacrifice was termed a priest, and while he went through the solemn rites at the altar, the people could do no more than "stand without praying," witnesses of the action taking place before their eyes. In the re-action which followed, the office of prophet or teacher entirely supplanted that of priest, and the fervor of his discourse eclipsed the power and importance of the Holy Sacrament. The people come to Church again—and this is the meeting point of the two extremes—simply to look on, while the preacher

preaches, as they did while the priest offered up the sacrifice. If there are any responses from the congregation in either case, they are from the choir over the people's heads. If the priest by his priestly acts is able to raise a departed soul into heaven, the preacher is able to do the same by his preaching efforts at the funeral. If members must prepare themselves for the Communion in the secret confessional, so must they now keep themselves in the proper spirit by telling their experience in the chosen circle of the faithful.

The truth is felt and acknowledged where Christ Himself in His three-fold office as our chief Prophet, only High Priest, and eternal king is properly apprehended. Then are also His ambassadors, who are sent to bear His benefits to the world, both priests and preachers. "Go, baptize and teach." Then, again, are also all those who receive those benefits, both prophets to confess His name, and priests to present themselves living sacrifices of thankfulness to Him. How then can they be mere listeners and spectators when the preacher preaches, and the priest prays? Let them take an active part in the service of God's house. Let them confess their sins to God, not in the presence of one man only or of a few, but to one another (St. James v. 16) in the general congregation, and together receive the assurance of pardon. Let them audibly pray as well as sing and give thanks, and then partake in common of the consecrated elements from the altar.

Some of these points we will do no more than briefly indicate, leaving others, not referred to, to suggest themselves to the mind of the reader. Some errors may be only on their way to the extreme, while others may be fully ripe, and merely waiting for a Luther, or an Athanasius, or perhaps better still, a St. John to be raised up as a personal incarnation, as it were, of the truth thus brought out, and to be a leader as well as a son of the Church.

Art. VI.—CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL.

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, A M., EMMITTSBURG, MD.

In her oldest Creed the Church professes to believe with regard to the atoning work of Christ, not only that He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, but also that He descended into hell. The latter statement, it is true, was not contained in so many words in the earliest forms of the Creed, but it was tacitly believed by the Church from the very beginning, to be involved in the reality of Christ's death. It found expression, however, in the Creed about the middle of the fourth century, and since then may be said to have been universally received by the Christian Church, as a constituent part of her chief symbol of faith. Its right to be in the Creed, we think, cannot be reasonably questioned. The Scripture basis on which it rests, is no less firm than that of the other articles. St. Peter in his sermon delivered on the day of Pentecost, as we find it given in the Acts of the Apostles, having cited from the sixteenth Psalm the words of David, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer Thy holy one to see corruption," says they were a prophecy concerning Christ which was fulfilled in His resurrection. "David being a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, He would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption" (Acts ii. 30, 31). But when it is written that His soul was not *left* in hell, of course the inference cannot be avoided that it was acknowledged to have been there, at least, for a time, and consequently that He must have descended into hell. It has, indeed, been sought to weaken the force of this conclusion by maintaining that the words of the

original Greek as well as Hebrew might properly be translated, "Thou wilt not relinquish or abandon my soul to hell," and that this might naturally mean that the soul should not fall under the dominion of this unwelcome abode; but, we think, that no one who will unbiassedly examine into the matter, and consider the words in the connection in which they occur, will fail to be convinced that the rendering of our common English version in this case is perfectly correct. Besides the Scripture passage to which reference has just now been made, there are others which, we believe, also, relate to the same event in the redemptive work of Christ. Such are the question of St. Paul, "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" (Eph. iv. 9); and the remarkable declaration of St. Peter, that "Christ being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19).

While, however, the universal Christian Church has received the article concerning Christ's descent into hell, as a constituent part of her Creed, there has, nevertheless, been not a little diversity of opinion with respect to its meaning and purpose. Various and very different expositions of it have been given, in earlier, as well as in more recent times. It might be interesting and instructive to examine critically some of these, but this is not the object of the present essay. Our principal design at this time is more especially to inquire into the meaning and purpose of the descent, as these are set forth in the Scriptures.

What is to be understood by the declaration, that Christ descended into hell, depends altogether on the sense in which the word hell is to be taken. This word as is well known. to all scholars is. in the case before us, a translation of the Greek word *Hades*, "Αἰδης. The latter occurs in the New Testament in all eleven times. Ten times in our common English version it is rendered *hell*, and once *grave*. In some cases this rendering is by no means a happy one, and in no case, as we shall endeavor to show, does the rendering given precisely

convey the meaning of the original. In the investigation in which we are engaged, the first question which, therefore, must be determined, is the meaning of the word *Hades*, as used in the New Testament Scriptures.

Now this word according to the best authorities on the subject, is a compound of privative *α* and *ἰδεῖν*, and, consequently, etymologically signifies the *unseen* or *invisible*. Among the Greeks it was a name originally given to the king or God of the nether or invisible world, but it was afterwards applied to that world itself, which was held to be the abode and estate of the departed, and which was understood to occupy a relatively lower position than the earth. This subterranean place was considered the destination of all alike, and, to a greater or less extent, the sphere of final rewards and punishments. It included in it both Elysium and Tartarus, the flowery and sunlit plains of the virtuous dead, and the dark, abysmal abode of the wicked. Notwithstanding, however, the different condition which was assigned to the good and to the bad in Hades, and the possibility, accordingly, of enjoying a certain amount of happiness there, still the general conception entertained, concerning the invisible world, was uninviting and repulsive. Those who dwelt there were after all only *shades*, forms without substance, dissatisfied spectres, having a semi-real existence, but altogether wanting in the fullness of life possessed by the living. When Achilles is encountered by Ulysses in Hades, and congratulated on being first among the dead, he says,

> "Noble Ulysses, speak not thus of death,
> As if thou could'st console me. I would be
> A laborer on earth and serve for hire
> Some man of mean estate who makes scant cheer,
> Rather than reign o'er all who have gone down
> To death."

And this, sad and gloomy as it is, seems to have been the predominant sentiment concerning Hades at every epoch of Greek civilization.

But the Apostles of our Lord were not Greeks, but Hebrews, and the term Hades did not come to them through the classics,

or with a simply classical meaning, but through the Septuagint, and as a translation of their own word *Sheol.* Before we can decide on its signification in the New Testament we must, therefore, inquire into the meaning of the latter term for which it is used. *Sheol* שְׁאוֹל according to the best recent authorities, is derived from the root שׁאל, which primarily signifies *to excavate, to make hollow*, and whose secondary meaning is *to ask, to demand.* The word itself occurs frequently in the Old Testament, and was used by the Hebrews to designate, like Hades, the common receptacle of the dead, the righteous as well as the wicked. It was represented as a place deep down in the earth, as is indicated by its etymology as well as by express statements of Scripture; as a place of silence, and darkness, and weakness, where all who enter it lead a joyless, shadowy and uncomfortable existence. That both the good and the bad at death went down to this dreary abode, is indicated by numerous passages in the Old Testament Scriptures. Jacob speaks of being brought down to Sheol with sorrow (Gen. xlii. 38), and David contemplates the possibility of making his bed there (Ps. cxxxix. 8), while it is expressly declared that the wicked shall be turned into Sheol and all the nations that forget God (Ps. ix. 17). "What man," asks the writer of the eighty-ninth Psalm, "shall live and not see death, but rescue his soul from the hand of Sheol?" (Ps. lxxxix. 48). But though all alike were believed to enter Sheol, the condition of all there was not held to be the same. The good are spoken of as going down in peace, but the bad as being cast down in punishment. "The wicked," we are told, "is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death" (Prov. xiv. 32). It is, indeed, denied by some that the ancient Hebrews looked upon Sheol as a place of retribution, but there can be no question that they thus conceived of it in their later history. Josephus, in describing the Pharisees, says: "They believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life"

(Ant. xviii. 1). And this, without doubt, was the common opinion in the time of Christ, as also we have reason to believe it was during the whole period of Jewish history. The place in Sheol where the righteous were at rest was called, at least in later times, *Paradise* or *Abraham's bosom*, and the place where the wicked suffered punishment, *Gehenna*.

In the particulars which have just been enumerated we may say that the Hebrew conception of Sheol was very like to that entertained by the Greeks concerning Hades. There is, however, at least one respect in which there is a marked difference between them. As we have indicated, the Greeks looked upon Hades as the final abode of man. This, however, was not the case with the Jews. According to their view, at least after the Babylonian captivity, and most probably from the very beginning, Sheol was only a temporary abode, the place where the soul dwelt between death and the general resurrection of the last day. This was certainly the view entertained by the great body of the people in the time of our Saviour's sojourn on earth. The whole tone of the New Testament on this subject clearly shows, that the doctrine of the resurrection was then generally held and considered as an essential part of the Jewish faith concerning the future life. And inasmuch as *Hades* was used by the Jews as a translation of *Sheol*, we may safely infer that they always attached to it the signification of the latter word. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that at the time the New Testament was written, *Hades* was the term employed by those writing, to designate the place and estate into which man enters at death, and from which the resurrection and the final judgment release him.

If now we examine the passages in which the word occurs in the New Testament, we shall find, that in every case the meaning at which we have arrived is appropriate. The first place in which we meet with it, is in the Lord's denunciation of Capernaum, the city in which He principally resided during His active ministry in Galilee. "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell (Hades)" (Matt. xi. 23). Here, of course, neither heaven nor Hades

is to be taken literally, but figuratively; the one to denote the highest exaltation, and the other the lowest degradation. Why Hades should be thus placed in antithesis to heaven, we shall readily understand, if we call to mind what has already been stated, namely, that the Jews conceived it as situated under the earth, and as including in it the deepest depths and the most undesirable existence. From the use of the word in this passage, it may be well here to remark, nothing definite can be inferred with regard to the nature of the place designated by it.

The next time the term occurs we find it in that memorable saying of our Lord, addressed to the chiefest of the Apostles: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell (Hades) shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18). In this case, again, the word is not used in a simply literal way, but in a manner somewhat rhetorical. No one, however, we think, who will carefully consider it in the connection in which it here stands will fail to be convinced that if taken in the sense of the kingdom of the dead, the whole passage will yield a deeper and fuller meaning, than if it be understood merely in the ordinary sense of hell. For what the Saviour would teach here, is not only that the powers of wickedness shall not finally prevail against the Church, although this is included in His words, but that death itself, also, shall not be able to destroy her. Though He Himself, and Peter, and the rest of the Apostles, should be put to death, and the ranks of the Church be thinned by martyrdom, yet would He triumph over the realms of death, and arise from the dead; and the Church be firmly established, and continue to exist and increase on earth, until the righteous dead should come forth again from their intermediate abode, death itself be destroyed, and Christ's chosen ones live and reign with Him forever in a new and glorified world. This is what we apprehend He meant when He said of the Church, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against her," and this is best implied when Hades is taken as the common abode of the departed, the kingdom of death.

We meet the word again in a different connection in the par-

able of the rich man and Lazarus, and here it is used for the first time in a purely literal sense. After describing the earthly condition of both, and contrasting the glorious manner in which the soul of the one was conveyed to its resting-place, and the pomp which attended the body of the other to the tomb, our Lord tells us, that "In hell (Hades) the rich man lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom" (Luke xvi. 23). Unquestionably in this case Hades, understood as being the common receptacle of the dead, and as including in its depths Gehenna, the place of fire and of the punishment of the wicked, and in its upper regions Abraham's bosom, the place of comfort where the righteous repose in peace and quiet, gives a more complete and consistent picture, than if understood merely to relate to the miserable habitation of the ungodly. If it be used here only to designate the place of punishment, as is maintained by some, it is hard to find a satisfactory reason why our Lord should add, with regard to the rich man, that he was in torments, as this would be implied in his being in hell; and his seeing Lazarus on looking up, and his being able to hold communication with Abraham, present also great difficulties. But if we take Hades in the sense in which the Jews commonly understood the word, as already intimated, all becomes plain. The statement that the rich man was in torments is then necessary to let us know definitely the place in which he was; that he should behold Lazarus on looking up is in full harmony with Jewish ideas in regard to the relative position of the respective abodes of the good and of the bad; and how communication could exist between the rich man and Lazarus also becomes intelligible, as both, though in different regions, are still in the same realm.

The passages which have now been considered are all of those in which Christ Himself makes use of the term Hades. There are a number of other passages, however, in which the word occurs in the New Testament. And first among these is that passage in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts ii. 25–31) to which reference has already been made as furnishing a sure basis for the article in the Creed concerning Christ's descent

into hell. That the word in this passage, if taken as signifying the common abode of the dead, makes the whole passage consistent, and gives a clear and intelligible sense, is so evident that we need not enter on any proof. Leaving this passage, then, we find the word again in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, in which, after quoting from Isaiah the words, "Death is swallowed up in victory," the Apostle triumphantly exclaims in the language of Hosea, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave (Hades), where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv. 55). That here also Hades, with the meaning for which we are contending, is as appropriate, to say the least, as grave, is very evident. But probably *θανατε* should be in the second clause as well as in the first, in which case the passage would not come into consideration in connection with Hades. We have referred to it, however, because ᾅδη is found in the received text, and this reading is retained by some good authorities on the subject.

The remaining passages in which Hades is found in the New Testament all belong to the Revelation of St. John. In that portion of Scripture it occurs four times. First we meet with it near the beginning of the Revelation, where the Lord reassures His beloved disciple who was utterly overwhelmed by the effulgence of His Majesty, by saying unto him: "Fear not: I am the First and the Last: I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keys of death and of hell (Hades)" (Rev. i. 18); and then again where the opening of the fourth seal is mentioned, and it is said: "I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell (Hades) followed with him" (Rev. vi. 8). Finally it occurs twice near the close of the Revelation where it is stated, that "The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (Hades) delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell (Hades) were cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. xx. 13, 14). In all these passages Hades understood as designating the abode and the estate of the departed, both of the good and of the bad, yields, without doubt, the most appropriate sense; as we have already

seen it does, also, in all the other passages in which it is found in the New Testament. For when the Lord said to the overwhelmed Apostle, "I have the keys of death and Hades," He meant to assure him that no harm could befall him, that even if his body should be dissolved and his soul enter the unseen world, yet would he not be beyond the protecting power of his Redeemer, who, having arisen from the dead, had absolute sovereignty over death and the state of separate spirits. That the Apostle under the circumstances in which he found himself, should believe that he was about to enter the spirit-world we can conceive, but not that he should dread being hurled into the abode of the lost. In the words addressed to him, we consequently conclude, Hades cannot simply mean hell. Then in the second passage above quoted, what more natural than that the whole realm of the dead should be represented as following Death! When the darts of the latter strike any one, whether he be an adversary of Jesus, or a friend, the gates of the invisible world inevitably open to receive his soul. When Hades, therefore, is described as following Death, it must include in it all the dead. And the same is true of it in the last passage in which it occurs in the Scriptures. In that passage, it can scarcely be questioned, the object is to show that all, whether then on earth, or in the separate state of the dead, must appear before God to be judged every man according to his works, and that with the general judgment death and the intermediate state will come to an end. But that the passage may teach this Hades must be understood in its broadest acceptation. It has, indeed, been objected to this, that if Hades included in its domain the Paradise to which Christ went with the penitent thief, there could be no reason for such an utter perdition as is implied in its being cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death. But surely the objector must have overlooked the fact that even the state of the pious dead is somewhat abnormal, and a consequence of sin. That the soul should ever exist separate from the body was not designed in the creation of man, but was brought about by transgression. Hence, St. Paul when he would comfort the Thessalonians with regard to their dead,

reminds them not of the present blessedness of those who had fallen asleep, but directs their attention to the glorious truth, that "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him;" and exhorts them to "comfort one another with these words" (1 Thess. iv. 13-18). And in writing to the Corinthians, even in the same connection in which he states that he was "willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord," he declares that he desired "not to be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. v. 1-8). Moreover, in the Revelation of St. John, "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held," and whom the Apocalyptist saw "under the altar," are even described as not yet fully satisfied (Rev. vi. 9, 10). Accordingly, it is evident that the Scriptures do not represent the state of the blessed dead as one of unmingled good and complete perfection. It carries in it still, in some respects, the consequences of sin, and therefore it can hardly be surprising after all, that when it comes to an end, it should be spoken of as cast into the lake of fire.

From what has now been stated it seems clear that in the New Testament the word Hades is used in the same sense in which it was used by the Jews generally in the times of the Apostles, and that it is a term employed to designate the kingdom or abode and estate of the departed between death and the resurrection, without any special reference to their moral condition. When, therefore, it is said in the Creed that Christ descended into hell, or Hades, this must signify, so far as it rests on a Scripture basis, that at His death His soul entered the common abode of the souls of the dead, and remained there while His body lay in the grave. We would yet here add, that this conclusion is in full harmony with the opinion of the early Church, as this finds expression in the writings of the Fathers. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Augustine, all maintained that the soul of Christ at His death entered into the habitation of departed spirits.

But having determined the general meaning of the statement that Christ descended into hell (Hades), the question still remains to be answered, Into which of the regions of the dead did He go? Did He descend into the miserable abode of the wicked and ungodly? or did He only enter that region of Hades in which the souls of the patriarchs, and prophets, and of the righteous dead, in peace were awaiting their final redemption? If the words of Christ Himself are to be decisive on this point, we must believe that He went to the abode where the latter were at rest. For on the Cross He declared to the penitent malefactor, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43). By Paradise in these words we must without doubt understand that part of Sheol (Hades) which is opposed to Gehenna, and which in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is called Abraham's bosom. "Nothing else," to use the language of Van Oosterzee, "could the forgiven one understand, who unquestionably had grown up entirely within the sphere of the Israelitish popular expectations; nothing else could the Saviour have had in view, since He undoubtedly from His death-hour to the resurrection morning must abide in the condition of separation." But if the penitent and forgiven one was that very day to be with Christ in Paradise, then must Christ have gone thither immediately at His death.

It may, however, be asked, Might He not subsequently have descended into the abode of the lost, and is it not implied that He did so in the question of St. Paul, "Now that He ascended what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" (Eph. iv., 9), and in the statement of St. Peter that "He went and preached unto the spirits in prison?" (1 Pet. iii. 19). We answer, He indeed might, but there is no evidence that He did; and that it is most in harmony with the fitness of things that He should not have done so. According to the popular Jewish ideas, as has already several times been remarked, Sheol, or Hades, occupied a relatively lower place than the earth. In the simple fact of Christ's entrance into Hades, therefore, the question of St. Paul has its full force. As regards the words of St. Peter, "in prison" here no doubt

is to be understood as equivalent to "in Hades." To view the common receptacle of the dead as a place of restraint, is not at variance with Hebrew thought; neither is this way of viewing it without somewhat of truth. But if it be insisted that prison in the passage under consideration, can only properly apply to the more undesirable region of Hades, even then are we not compelled by the language of the Apostle to hold, that Christ entered the abode of the damned? For in the parable given by St. Luke, the rich man being in torments, is addressed by Abraham, although an impassable gulf separates the two. And if Abraham being in Paradise, could address one being in the place of woe, no reason can be assigned why Christ might not have done the same. Moreover, it is difficult to understand why He should have entered the place of those doomed to eternal perdition. He could not have gone thither, as some have erroneously supposed, to complete the work of atonement by suffering there the horrid and inexpressible anguish of the lost, for His own words, as well as the general tenor of the Scriptures on this point, clearly teach that His sufferings were ended on the Cross. The very words before us themselves indicate that what they reveal belongs not to the passive, but to the active part of His redeeming work. Neither can we reasonably suppose that He went thither to deliver those who were in torments from their dread condition, or merely to exhibit His triumph over them. Either of these suppositions is at direct variance with the teaching of Scripture, as this has been understood by the universal Church of all ages. Then it would seem in every way more in harmony with the fitness of things, as already intimated, that the soul of Christ should go among the souls of those who had walked acceptably before God and who were enjoying the fruits of their faithfulness. When Christ came into the world He came unto His own, and so there is reason to believe that when He left it at death, He went to His own. So thought most of the early Christian Fathers, and in this we believe they were right.

But there is still another question which arises in reference to what is to be understood by Christ's descent into the realm

of the dead, and which here may claim some notice; and that is concerning the locality of this realm. According to the views of the Greeks and Hebrews, as we have seen, Hades or Sheol was located under the earth, and was a place distinct from earth and from heaven. Elysium, or Paradise, and heaven did not occupy the same locality, either in the conception of the Greek or of the Jew. But the common opinion among Protestant Christians is that there are only three distinct places in which man may have an abiding-place, and these three are, earth, heaven and hell. That there is no reason to believe that the ancient conception as to locality, should be received as literally correct, every one who has investigated the subject will readily admit. Accustomed to place the bodies of their dead under the earth, and altogether ignorant of the formation of the globe on which they lived, nothing is more natural than that men in early times should imagine that the soul on quitting the body, descended and took up its abode in a vast cavity underneath. That the inspired writers of Scripture should use the words designating the place and estate of the dead in their ordinary signification, is in full harmony with their acknowledged custom; and they might do so in this case more especially, because, though the conception of the place might not be literally correct, yet there was a truth connected with it, namely this, that the disembodied state, in some respects at least, is for all a lower condition of existence than that of the living, and a withdrawing of the soul into the innermost chambers of existence. But though we deny the literal correctness of the Jewish conception as to place, the question still remains as to whether it is Scriptural to identify the abode of the blessed dead with heaven. As the Scriptures themselves throw but little light on this question, and are rather silent with regard to it, no doubt, for wise purposes, it would be folly to presume to give any decided opinion on the subject. However, the words addressed by our Lord, immediately after His resurrection, to Mary Magdalene: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father" (John xx. 17), seem to imply that the Paradise to which He went with the penitent

thief, and the heaven to which He afterwards ascended, are not identical as to location. If they were, it is difficult to understand, how Jesus could address Mary as He did. If His soul immediately on His giving up the ghost on the Cross, entered heaven, how could He consistently say "I have not yet ascended?" That the intermediate state of man's existence differs from the present state, and from the glorified state that will be after the resurrection, is most certain. And inasmuch as the world in which we now live is adapted to our present state, and the heavenly world into which we shall enter at the resurrection will, according to the Scriptures, be perfectly adapted to our glorified state, we may reasonably infer that the place in which the soul is during its intermediate existence, is also adapted to its peculiar state. But as the states are different, may we not suppose that the corresponding places are also different? It may indeed be said that the Scriptures speak of the righteous dead, as being with the Lord, and that this plainly proves that they are in heaven. But it is probable that the passages usually referred to in this connection, are only intended to teach us that at death believers enter into a fuller life communion with Christ, and become possessed of a higher consciousness of things unseen and eternal.

In considering, however, the subject of place, or locality, with reference to the dead, we must not forget that they are not necessarily separated from us by outward distance, nor in any respect by mere barriers of sense; and that the sphere in which they move, is altogether different from the material sphere of time and space in which we are. For aught that we positively know the place which we now occupy, and that where the dead are, and the final abode of the blessed, may all lie in the same sphere of space, just as a man may be in a state of sickness, of sleep, and of health, all in turn, in the same locality. We do not say that this is or will be the case, but we affirm that it may be so. The main thing with regard to the realm of the dead, which we must not overlook, is that the condition of those in it is altogether different from our present condition, and from what our final condition will be,

and that it is really only an intermediate state or condition. There is a tendency on the part of many in our times to overlook this, and to make the blessedness of believers immediately after death, and their final blessedness, identical. But such a view must vitiate the whole conception of Christ's redemptive work, as it leaves no proper room for the resurrection of the body. As a corrective of this false view, it cannot be improper to insist at least on the possibility of the pious dead occupying a different place in space now, from that which will be occupied by them after the resurrection morning shall have dawned on them.

But the question having been disposed of as to what is to be understood by the statement, that Christ descended into hell, or rather Hades, it still remains for us to inquire into the purpose of this descent. Why did His soul when it left the Cross enter into the abode of the dead? What was the end and use of His so humbling Himself? One great purpose, yea we may say the chief end of His so doing, was, no doubt, that He might undergo all the conditions of death, and so through death destroy him who had the power of death, that is the devil. The souls of those who had died before Him, all descended into the realm of death, and were detained there. And herein we may say consisted the great evil of death, that it not only separated soul and body, but that it kept these separate, and so, as it were, thwarted the object of man's existence and turned it into vanity. Now as it was necessary that Christ should be made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, so was it also necessary that His death should be a true death. But it would not have been a true death if He had not descended into Hades; and consequently His resurrection would not have been a true resurrection, and men could have had no assurance that in Him there was deliverance from death and Hades. In entering the realm of the dead, however, He underwent all the conditions of death, and in coming from thence He, therefore, truly arose from the dead, leading captivity captive in His own person, and thus preparing the way to give gifts unto

men. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him" (1 Thess. iv. 14). From all this it is evident that the article in the Creed concerning the descent into hell is not unimportant, as some suppose, but a fundamental part of the Christian faith. Without the descent there could have been no ascent, no remission of sins, no resurrection of the body, no life everlasting.

The declaration of St. Peter that Christ "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. iii. 19), would seem, however, to indicate that to undergo all the conditions of death was not the sole object of our Lord in descending into the abode of the dead, but that it was also part of His gracious purpose to carry forward the work of redemption among departed spirits. That these remarkable words of the chief of the Apostles teach anything of this kind, it is true, has been most positively denied. Augustine, Aquinas, and many others eminent in the Church, have strongly maintained that the preaching by the Spirit was that by Noah, the preacher of righteousness, to the antediluvians. Others, still, have contended that it was that of the Apostles to the wicked around them, whose souls as spiritually dead were imprisoned in their bodies. But these explanations, to say the least, are forced and unnatural, and have properly been designated as ingenious shifts resorted to for the sake of getting over a difficulty. The connection in which the declaration is made, as well as the grammatical construction of the whole passage in the original Greek, requires us to understand the Apostle to assert that the soul of Christ at death entered the underworld and there preached to the disembodied spirits. In full accordance with this is the statement made further on in the same epistle: "For for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit" (1 Pet. iv. 6).

What was the precise nature of Christ's preaching in the spirit-world, and who all were among those to whom He pro-

claimed the gospel has not been definitely revealed, and it is not possible for us consequently in our present state fully to know. Various and widely different opinions have been entertained on these points. While some have held that Christ as a spirit instructed spirits in a way analogous to that in which when in the flesh He instructed living men, others have supposed that His entrance into the kingdom of the dead in itself as being in fact an announcement of the completion of redemption, was the preaching referred to by the Apostle. The greater part of the early Church believed that this preaching was limited to those who had died in the faith, and were awaiting the coming Messiah, but some thought that its glorious message reached all in the spirit-world. The more common view of the ancient Church is thus expressed by Irenæus: "The Lord descended into the regions beneath the earth, preaching His advent there also, and (declaring) the remission of sins received by those who believe in Him. Now all those believed in Him who had hope towards Him, that is, those who proclaimed His advent and submitted to His dispensations, the righteous men, the prophets and the patriarchs" (B. iv. C. 27). Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Hippolytus, also, use language of similar import. In more recent times opinions on this subject have been very conflicting, as well as varied, so that it is scarcely possible to designate any view as the more generally accepted.

While, however, in our present state we shall probably always remain in a great measure ignorant of the full meaning of the Apostle's statement with regard to Christ's preaching to the dead, yet nevertheless it unquestionably reveals to us the important truth that in some way His entrance into the world of departed spirits was made for them a means of grace and salvation. Hades after His descent into it was no longer what it was before. As His advent into this world brought life and immortality to light here, so also did it in the abode of the dead. It indeed so changed the character of that abode that Hades has ceased to be a fitting name for it. It dispelled for believers all its gloom, and lighted it up with unspeakable joy. And that it has done so was not accidental, but a part of

the mission and life work of Christ. He took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, that He might be the Saviour of mankind, not merely of men in this world, but of all men, whether living or dead, who should believe on His name. He was sent that He might supply all the wants of man's being not only in the present but also in the future. But that He might be the Saviour of all, the Redeemer of man's whole life, it was necessary that He should make provision for the needs of His chosen ones not only in this world, but also in the spirit-world. It was necessary for the children of God who lived before His advent, and were then in the spirit-world; and it was necessary for those who now live, but who also, in time, must take up their abode among the dead, and there await their final redemption in the resurrection at the last day.

ART. VII.—THE ELVES.

BY REV. R. LEIGHTON GERHART.
White Marsh, Pa.

PART I.

OF gossamers, the finest thread
The crafty spiders deftly spread
With fell intent, o'er twig and tree,
To snare their prey, be't fly or flea,
You elves your fairy garments weave,
Enthroned at dewy morn or eve
Upon the fragrant, blooming cheek
Of flowers fair, both soft and sleek.
Gaily then to yourselves you sing,
While to the wind you lightly swing,
Which loaded down with odors sweet
Bloweth warm with summer heat;
And the sunlight shining round
Broodeth still upon the ground,
Illuming grass and flower and tree
With golden beams of bright gloryè;

And the great Blue-bottle fly,
And the June-bug droneth nigh;
And the airy thistle down
O'er the green is sailing shown;
And Butterflies in purple coat
On waveless wings do idly float,
Settling down where'er they be
To seek for sweets with spying e'e;
While Humming-birds of ruby throat,
Their presence near quickly denote,
As low they sound their tuneful noise,
And swiftly dart and lightly poise.
And thus you sit in bowers of bliss,
Where joy, not sorrow, always is,
To weave your robes of silvery hue
From threads the spiders spin for you.
And when, at morn, the glances run,
Shot by that golden god, the sun,
Athwart the darkened earth, and light
With power divine each vale and height,
While half the world is yet asleep,
From out your bowers you slyly peep,
Then downward fluttering lightly fly,
And in the dews your garments dye,
Just ere in rain-bow colors dight,
They vanish in the morning light.
Then, as, with self-important hum,
The Humble-bee anear doth come,
With ostentatious diligence,
The gathered honey bearing thence
To store within his lowly nest,
Which on the ground doth buzzing rest,
Circling him round you fairies crowd,
To beg, with importunings loud,
A yellow plume from off his side
To cap the dress so richly dyed.
But th' Humble-bee's a prudent wight,
And turns each chance with wondrous slight,
That he may add t' his secret store,
If e'en it be, but one mite more;
And then, besides, he knows right well,
Both how to buy, and how to sell.
And so, though inly pleased to see
You crowding round so eagerly,

With wrinkled brows he may demur,
"They're very pretty, to be sure,
But winter's coming, ha! you know?
With bitter wind and chilling snow,
And these I need to keep me warm.
Pray, what shields you from winter's harm?"
But you, my elves, feel little care
To hoard for future food or wear;
For future good, the bee may strive,
But for the present you will live;
And for that joy, rather than lost,
All you possess must pay the cost;
For every impulse of the hour
Rules for the time each fairy power,
Dispelling every thought of worth
In all besides of heaven and earth.
And so the bargain's quickly made,
The feather given, the pay is said;
Which quick to yield you fly before,
And show the sweets that lie in store
Where Butterfly hath never been,—
Which Humming-bird hath never seen.
And here the bee in honey sweet
Revels with head, and wings, and feet,
Rejoicing o'er the wondrous trade,
Which for a feather, he hath made;
Of his own wisdom loves to harp,
And prides himself on being 'sharp;'
This to himself, while he doth cull
And stuff with honey his belly full;
Then having loaded down his thighs,
He plumes himself and off he flies;
With self-applause now loudly sings,
And carelessly from off his wings,
The honied odors he doth shake,
Thus scenting far his airy wake.

PART II.

And perked in all the finery
Of gossamer robes and feathers gay,
You dapper elves, with merry din,
Your frolic sports at once begin.
And first, as on the dewy air,
Upon some journey far or near,

The winds your wrinkled weaver bear,
Upon his web you seize, and there
Do twist yourselves in every way
Gymnastic antics to display.
Now spinning round, on one foot go,
Now hang suspended by a toe,
Now walk the rope, now skin the cat,
Now hang and swing, and all that.
No acrobat of human skill
Can show such slight, and never will.
And thus, because you've nought to do,
You tease the folks that work for you.
For just before his journey's done,
His patience out, and thread near spun,
The spider spies you hang and swing
Upon his far extended string,
And flieth back inflamed with rage
To nab you while you thus engage.
But ah, too late, for quick you spy him,
And far on airy wings do fly him,
That on some flower you may alight
To mimic him with all your might;
At which he creeps him to his den,
And from very rage doth grin,
But from his den sly looking out,
Quietly eyes your fairy rout,
Hoping still to overtake you,
Then for this to scratch and shake you.
But moved, perchance, by some new whim,
Or yet fatigued with teasing him,
With querying eyes, you peep around
To see what next is to be found
To satisfy the warm desire
For mischief, which doth still inspire
Each tiny heart. Nor long, indeed,
Do you of this e'er stand in need.
And quickly now you do espy
A purple coated butterfly,
As he prepares at ease to sup
The golden drink from crimson cup.
Into the bell-shaped flower he peers;
Of coming ills he hath no fears;
But slowly sways his shining wings
With self-complacent murmurings,

And closely scans the honey store,
With the critic eye of an epicure,
To see if it in quality
Will suit a royal butterfly.
'Tis prime;—well suited to his taste;—
O he will have a luscious feast!
Ah!—could he but behind him see,
His joy would turn to miserie;—
You nimble elves are capering there,
Light dancing on th' elastic air,
Whispering slyly, mockingly,
In mischief's very ecstacy.
He hears the bees about him hum,
And the grasshopper sound his drum;
He feels the sunlight, still and warm,
Enfolding soft his dainty form,
While musky odors, subtile, sweet,
Inflame his heart with amorous heat.
"O joy! O what a world of bliss,"
Languidly he sighs, "is this,"
And shutting his eyes, in expectation
Of the nectar's titillation,
Into the flower thrusts down his head;—
His happiness is quickly sped;—
With taunting tongue you fairies shout,
Then seize his legs and drag him out.
O, how your little eyes did twinkle!
How your cheeks did puff and wrinkle!
As bending all your lusty might
You struggled with the flouting wight.
He flaps his wings! he flaps again!
He flaps once more!—'tis all in vain;
And then, alas! unlucky fellow,
From sucking honey begins to bellow.

PART III.

In fragrant gardens kept with care,
Where gushing fountains cool the air
High tossing waters crystal clear,
That ever rise to ever fall;
Where big fountains rising tall,
Incessantly their waters throw
O'er little founts that spout below,
While over all the sun doth stream
To multiply his golden beam

In myriad drops, that upward go,
Then pelt and splash the pool below;
With myriad gems the pool they sprinkle
And softly sound a bell-like tinkle,
Ever rising, ever falling,
Their silvery voices never palling;
Where pebbly pathways, here and there,
Wander idly everywhere,
Wandering on without intent,
Only on a rambling bent,
As o'er hill and dale they run,
At times in shade and then in sun;—
And without aim thus onward tending,
They go by ways and scenes unending;—
Now seeking out some cool retreat
From ardent summer's sultry heat,
Directly, see, they winding rove
Through coolest coverts of the grove;
Where, as the wind with flowing motion
Keeps the tree-tops in commotion,
Slow the branches wave and nod,
And sunbeams flicker o'er the sod;
And lights and shadows, constant, chase
Each other from each other's place,
While hid within the woody gloom,
That tuneful bird of nun-like plume,
With thrilling note may oft be heard
To mock aloud or beast or bird;
And other birds of plumage gay,
The Gold-finch, Blue-bird, Red-breast, Jay,
Of varied note, and varied wing,
Are seen to fly, and heard to sing;
Now smoothly running outward drawn
They go by plots of level lawn;
Now sweeping round a fair pavilion
Rich with gold and gay vermilion;
By mimic falls, and mimic mountains,
By silent lakes, and gushing fountains,
By dainty beds of dainty flowers,
Then, by rustic grots and bowers,
Where creeps the ivy's dark-leaved vine,
And clinging honey-suckles twine,
To hang their heavy clusters down,
That sway with gentle breezes blown,

Filling all the air around them
With the odors that abound them;—
In scenes like these you take delight,
You fays of flowers, flecks of light,
For here you joy the sweetest pleasure,
Without thought and without measure.
Now seize the pollen love consigned
With amorous sighs unto the wind,
From hand to hand toss it in sport,
With many a jibe and sharp retort.
"O why my messenger detain?"
The anxious blossom doth complain.
The mild appeal unheeded falls,
And still you toss the golden balls.
At last fatigued, you hie away
To violet beds with purple gay,
Where shielded from intrusion bold
By covering leaf, your loves you hold.
But soon as Fire-flies hint of night,
Or Glow-worms show a transient light,
The petals drawing quickly close,
In sleeping flowers, you find repose.
Yet oft as in dull night's domain,
The still moon holds her dreamy reign,
Lured by the splendor of the scene,
The silvery haze, the dewy green,
In full array you issue out,
And here and there, and round about,
With nimble feet you beat the ground,
In th' mazy dance's giddy round,
Or lead through air a shining train,
While chanting low a soft refrain;
Your fairie voices ringing clear
Far through the dewy atmosphere.
Behind the trees, in apish shape,
The shadows grinning, crouch and gape,
And gabber in their wan surprise,
Thus spying elfin mysteries.
And wakeful leaves, that watch do keep,
Arouse their mates from quiet sleep,
That they with them may silent see
The nightly games of sprite fairie.
Thus fays of flowers sport by day,
Thus often while the night away.

Art. VIII.—AMERICAN THEOLOGY.*

"In *North America* theology, so far as we are able to survey it, has as yet no connected literary history. The numberless parties there existing, immersed for the most part in practical matters, have not as yet been able to do much for the cultivation or advancement of theological science. But the introduction of English, Scotch, and especially German theology now abundantly taking place, is transporting into that country many elements of culture, and theology will, in the midst of this increasing scientific traffic and intercourse, undoubtedly obtain in that country—though it may do this by first passing through a process of fermentation—a new, and, indeed, an independent form and combination, which by reason of the perfect independence of the State enjoyed by religious communities, may in many respects resemble the development of the Church in the first centuries. German theology, represented especially by Professor Schaff, and his like-minded colleague, Nevin, but more or less known to all the more able theologians through its literature, may expect to obtain, by means of the German immigration, and the educational institutions connected therewith, a lasting hold upon the country." *Hist. Prot. Theology*, by Dr. Dorner.

There is much truth in what Dr. Dorner here says of American theological science, and the same thing is implied by Dr. Schaff, when he says, in his inaugural address, "The time has now fully come for America to produce her own distinctive theology, not, indeed, in selfish and conceited isolation, but in organic union with the Catholic Theology of evangelical Chris-

* The Theology for our Age and Country, an Address delivered by Dr. Philip Schaff, at his Inauguration as Professor of Apologetics, Symbolics and Polemics, in the Union Seminary. New York: Rogers & Sherwood, 94 & 96 Nassau Street. 1872.

tendom throughout the world." There have been earnest movements in American Church life, which carry with them certain elements of originality, but we must acknowledge, that our religious history has contributed but little as yet, in the way of any connected organic development, to the theological science of the world. What has been accomplished, however, may be regarded as giving good promise for the future. There have been, here and there, isolated movements in church life and theology, which reveal the earnestness and freshness of American Christianity. In the history of each of the denominations in this country, from the founding of the original colonies, and the establishment of the first congregations, there are many highly interesting facts and features. These are interesting, especially with reference to the future of this country. They are, in some respects, like the first efforts of children learning to walk. Thus the Puritans of New England passed through a childhood and minority in their vain efforts to establish a pure theocracy in the New World. Their theology, too, as developed in the school of Edwards, Hopkins, Dwight, Taylor, Park, reveals at least a spirit of earnest activity and inquiry so characteristic of the New England mind.

The Presbyterian body, as it has grown up in other sections of the country, has been very decidedly conservative and stationary in its theological history. It has produced very able expounders of the Calvinistic system as set forth in the Westminster Confession, but their theology has scarcely ventured, at any single point, to take a step in advance. They prefer to hold fast the good they have, rather than run any risk in reaching out for that which is better. Yet the better can never be reached without a venture of faith. Calvinism, in this old form, as set forth with strict regard to orthodoxy, for instance, in the recently published theology of Dr. Hodge, marks a status of Presbyterianism in this country; but it is rapidly being left behind, and losing its hold upon the minds of the people, in this age of progress. So far as foreign influence is concerned, the Presbyterian theology of this country has stood in close communion with the Scotch and Irish, while the Episcopalian

Church has continued to draw its theological inspiration from England. The controversies going on in the mother-Church have found echoes in this country. The High-Church, Low-Church, and Broad-Church parties in England have corresponding parties in the Episcopal Church of America. Its peculiar claim and position among the Protestant denominations of this country, has led the Episcopal Church to concentrate its energies in maintaining these claims, and in giving them practical emphasis, rather than in seeking to build up a theology. The great Methodist body, foremost in practical zeal and activity, has but just commenced to organize Theological Seminaries. Its theology is yet to come.

While German theology has exerted considerable influence upon all the theological centres of this country, its chief power has been exerted upon the Churches of German origin, the Lutheran and the (German) Reformed. The professors and ministers in these bodies keep up communion between the theology of Germany and their own labors and studies. In the Reformed Church this communion with the philosophy and theology of Germany found a medium in Dr. F. A. Rauch, first President of Marshall College, and Dr. Philip Schaff, for a number of years Professor in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pa. With these men was associated Dr. J. W. Nevin. Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff were the leaders in the theological movement in the Reformed Church, which commenced about thirty years ago. These are the two men, to whom Dr. Dorner refers as representatives of German theology in America, and no one will hesitate to say that they have been able representatives. Dr. Schaff, by his German education, would naturally stand in close sympathy with the latest and best movements in German theology; Dr. Nevin, an American, has been equally interested in it from his interest in the Reformed Church, and in the progress of Protestantism at large. The movement, at the head of which these two men have stood, has certainly shown much vigor and activity. The earlier articles of both, in the "Mercersburg Review" and the "Kirchenfreund," their published works, in addition to their lectures in

the Seminary and College, as well as their present activity, and the activity of the movement of which they have been the acknowledged leaders, show a power and a life which has deservedly arrested the attention of the greatest theologians of the Old World.

In the Lutheran Church several phases of the Lutheranism of Germany are exhibited. The Missouri and the Buffalo Synods represent one wing, the General Synod another, and the General Council still another. While Lutheran theology in this country is influenced by the fortunes of Lutheranism in Germany, and employs the masters there as guides in teaching, yet owing to the new and different relation it occupies here to the State and to other Churches, it promises here an independent growth and original results. Dr. Krauth, Professor in the Seminary at Philadelphia, has recently published the ablest statement and defence of conservative Lutheranism that has yet appeared in this country.

Indeed, a close and careful examination of the inner history and workings of the various denominations in this country, would reveal, beyond what such men as Dr. Dorner from across the Atlantic can appreciate, much independent and original preparation for the production of American theological science. Whether "the time has now fully come for America to produce her own distinctive theology," as Dr. Schaff seems to think, or not, of course will have to be decided by the event. The prevalence of the sect spirit, which has been so much in the way of catholic, free, theological thinking, is certainly still an incubus. The effort of each denomination and sect to build up and extend its own interests, the intense struggle for vantage ground and controlling power, while the country is yet being filled up with population,—this certainly has been one of the chief hindrances to anything like free progress in theological science. Each denomination has felt, that its theology must be a defence of its peculiar claims, as representing the truest and best phase of Christianity, to the condemnation of that of every other. Instead of moving forward to the earnest study of questions and problems which concern the Church at large, and Chris-

tianity as a whole, the tendency has been, and still is, to elevate particular questions and dogmas as of paramount importance. With one denomination everything hangs on the question of Episcopal ordination; with another, on a metaphysical theory of predestination; with another, on the form and subjects of baptism, and so on to the end of the chapter. We agree with Dr. Schaff, that there are signs of a better day coming. The assault upon Christianity from science and philosophy, as well as practical infidelity, the growth and pretensions of Romanism, have served to direct the Protestant Churches of this country to consider more earnestly those subjects and questions, which concern them in common. Especially have the attacks upon the Scriptural representation of the life of Christ concentrated interest. After all, the divine-human person of Christ is of more account to each and all our Christian denominations, than any separate question of a mere denominational character. Here the assault is on the citadel of our common Christianity. All must be united here against the common foe, who seeks to rob Christ of His glory and His throne.

It is felt, moreover, that this sectarian spirit has robbed the Church, to a large extent, of its power over the world. The conquest of the world requires united, concentrated effort. In the work of Christian education, of missionary labor, of benevolent and eleemosynary institutions, of opposition to popular evils, the Church needs a concentration of her energies against an organized kingdom of darkness. All this, we say, has begun to work among the American Churches towards union. But the beginnings are very slow and feeble. The healing of the breach between two large branches of the Presbyterian denomination is but a small step towards what seems to be required. And even in that case it is yet to be seen whether it will work any real unity between the theology of Princeton and New York.

But whether the time has now fully come, or not, certainly we may hope it is coming, and that contributions to theological science will rapidly increase in this country. It will undoubtedly serve to hasten the time, if the American Churches can

come into closer sympathy with the progress of theology in Germany. We advocate no mere mechanical transfer of German learning, no slavish subserviency to foreign schools of theology. Mercersburg theology has never yielded itself blindly to German guidance in this way. It has used material from abroad, and in the main, worked in the current of German theology, which certainly may justly claim to be the most advanced which the age has produced, but it is not just an imitation or reproduction of this, as Dorner's criticism of it clearly showed. Yet, we say, it will be of immense advantage to the theology of America to have brought to its use the latest and ripest productions of German Christian scholarship. Hence we esteem the work undertaken by Professors Smith and Schaff, to bring out in this country a philosophical and theological library, to consist of translations of the latest and best German works, as of great importance. And we rejoice in this work none the less because Mercersburg theology and the Reformed Church used to be stigmatized, just because it had so much to do with German theology. Times have changed. These latest works in philosophy and theology will be found to contain traces of Hegelian thinking and of Schleiermacher's labors, too, but they will be none the less valuable on that account. They will not be put under the ban, as belonging however remotely to the school of Hegel or Schleiermacher. Is not America of age? And can she not trust herself to read and study such authors without adopting every opinion of these men? Surely, surely.

The catholic and conscientious spirit of this literature will exert a beneficial influence upon American theologians. We cannot be said to be fully up to the merits of German scholars in this respect. Their writings, even when of a controversial character, are for the most part free from the personalities which characterize our literature. They can even treat rationalism as it deserves, without the manifestation of any bitterness towards its adherents. Especially are they conscientious in taking no unfair advantage of their opponents. They would regard it as unworthy a scholar, much more unworthy a Christian, to quote from an opponent what would misrepresent his

true meaning. Truth for them is the one great object of scholarly search and labor, and they pursue it without regard to personal considerations. Even if it leads them into positions which for the time seem to stand in contradiction with orthodoxy, they meet with respect on all sides. They have their faults, too, beyond question. They have somewhat of pedantry, and perhaps not strict enough regard for orthodoxy, but we could heartily wish that their virtues might be learned by all theological writers in America. The odium *theologicum* certainly appears among us so painfully, that it is no wonder some turn away from all theological controversy with a feeling of contempt for the wranglers. We think that as the spirit of sectarianism begins to lose its power, there will be a change in this respect.

We have said, that German theologians, and German theology, have their faults. Among these may be named the want of more close and living communion between the professors and the great body of the Church. This want arises, no doubt, in part from the relation of the Church to the State which exists in Germany. The Church is supported by the State, and is independent, so far as support is concerned, of the people. The universities are founded and supported by the State. The professors are called to their chairs by the same power. The consequence is, the people will feel that they are not directly concerned in these institutions and men, and the professors will feel removed from the practical cares and workings of the Church. To this may be added the innate propensity of the German scholar to live in the world of speculation. If they can work out the problem theoretically they are satisfied. This ends the difficulty for them. A stranger visiting their country finds the churches and people largely given over to rationalism. Comparatively few attend church at all, and things generally look discouraging. He visits the University, and there he finds them jubilant. The battle has been fought, —the victory won. Strauss and Bauer have been vanquished. Their objections have been met. All is safe. And yet this battle has been fought up in the air, instead of upon the solid earth. At any rate the people have seen or felt but little of it.

All this gives a one-sided tendency to German theology, which we may hope to escape in this country. *The voluntary principle*, which Dr. Schaff prefers, with all its faults, works a healthful communion between the institutions of the Churches and the people. These institutions are established and endowed by the people. They are represented in the Boards, Synods, Assemblies, &c., by whom the professors are elected. The people read. Even the most elaborate productions find their way, to some extent at least, out among the people. Theological questions and controversies at once touch the popular chord. One result is, that the teachers and leaders thus are compelled to look at the practical bearing of every question, and this gives a healthful tone to their theories. It may indeed be said, that all this has its corresponding evil. Learned men are thus often judged at the bar of an incompetent tribunal. But we believe the evil is less than that of the other principle. Sound learning and faith will in the end command the voluntary respect and reverence of the people.

To this we may add the natural turn of American mind as one of the conditions which will determine the character of American theology. It is not devoid of the power of speculation. With all the rush of business, the thirst for wealth, the utilitarian spirit, there is also in the constitution of American mind a vigorous tendency to reach out after the ideal. This comes often as a reaction from mere earthly pursuits, but it is also constitutional. Yet it is true, that the undertone of American mind has inherited the strong, earnest, practical bent of England, without the isolated spirit of the English nation. Theories in America will always be studied in reference to their practical application. The prosperity of the Church, the advancement of society, the purification and elevation of public morals, will always enter as conditions into our theological science. And this will give strength and breadth to our Church literature.

The commingling, too, of denominations, if the evils of the sect spirit can once be overcome, may work a many-sided fullness for American theology, which we find in no other nation.

These various denominations tend, it is true, to develop truth in a one-sided way, but if they can be brought to lay hold of the truth of Christianity in its central significance, that is, see that there are articles of faith that are more comprehensive than the peculiar views, or hobbies, of any one denomination or sect, these very one-sided developments in theology may be turned to some account as material. They will at least have explored the nooks and corners of theology, and may at least serve as warnings against elevating again that which is non-essential into the place of that which is essential.

One thing is certain, the theology of the coming age will have to be an advance. The old has served its day. It was a power in its time. But it can no more continue to hold sway than other modes of life, and forms of science that have passed away. History everywhere bears testimony on this point. The theology of the seventeenth century could not suffice for the eighteenth, and this latter is superceded in the nineteenth century. All departments of learning and science have advanced, and theology must not lag behind. One word yet in regard to the theological position of Dr. Schaff, whose inaugural we have been noticing. It is said in some quarters, that there is nothing in this address, which indicates that Dr. Schaff continues to hold the peculiar views he held while a professor at Mercersburg. It is just as true, that there is nothing to indicate that he has changed any of those views. Indeed the address contains the substance of what he used to give the students at Mercersburg in his *Theological Encyclopedia*. Dr. Schaff has no doubt changed some of his views in regard to American Christianity since his earlier years in this country, as would be natural, but he says that he teaches substantially now what he taught then. In Church History his own works are chiefly read on the most difficult period, through the first six centuries. The dogmatic theology is in substantial agreement with the best German theology, and in accord with the Heidelberg Catechism, and the teaching in our Theological Seminary is substantially what it was then also.

The teaching is by lectures, and therefore free. Different uses

may be made by different minds with this theology—some may make it the occasion of going where it does not legitimately lead. But the greater part of the hue and cry raised against what is called Mercersburg theology is based on misconception. It is soundly Protestant. But it is not satisfied to move on in old ruts. The old prejudice against it because of its connection with German philosophy and German theology may be expected more and more to pass away, as German theological literature comes to be more generally understood in this country. Dr. Schaff is doing a good work in aiding to bring this literature before the American public in its latest and purest form.

ART. IX.—DO GHOSTS APPEAR?

BY CHAS. F. GAST, ESQ., A. M.

"*Do Ghosts appear?*" is an inquiry which in this metallic age impinges at once upon long dominant prejudices. To the unthinking masses, who never seek to separate the wheat from the chaff, it suggests unconsciously the vulgar notions of hobgoblins, spooks, and other fanciful creations, and is for this reason expelled into the region of blind credulity and superstitious terror. To the learned, ever careful of venturing a hard-earned scientific reputation in a field of research where unexaggerated truth may so easily be construed into dreamy nonsense, it has long been interdicted by a relentless prejudice, which would consign all phenomena of ghostly visitants to nursery lore and fable. Although the idea of ultra-mundane intervention has been attested ever since civilization first dawned upon the world—although every student of the Scriptures finds himself compelled to admit its frequent occurrence in later times—although it has ever been intuitively *felt*, yet

our common orthodoxy has been seemingly fearful to accredit facts, as well authenticated as any upon which issues of life and death are daily determined in our courts of justice, lest they clash with theological dogmas that have long already outlived the intelligence of mankind. Men have always been inclined to slight phenomena, which according to their circumscribed view of the Divine economy, *should* not exist. Chemistry was spoken of by Chaucer as "an elfish art, taught and conducted by spirits." Mesmerism was obliged to fight its way through charlatans and impostors, through gross abuse and frequent mystification; it was rejected a priori by a Bailly, a Lavoisier, and a Franklin; yet now scarcely a scientist can be found, who doubts the verity of the mesmeric state, and even of its higher phenomena.

Such has been the attitude of learned men towards ultramundane interference of the dead with the living. Instead of studying well-attested facts, and without even an a priori examination of the subject, they dismiss all narratives of apparitions as the off-shoots of foolish superstition. Isaac Taylor in his Physical Theory of another Life, says: "In considering questions of this sort, we ought not to listen for a moment to those frequent but impertinent questions that are brought forward with a view of superseding the inquiry; such, for example, as these: What good is answered by the alleged extranatural occurrences? Is it worthy of the Supreme Wisdom to permit them? The question is a question, first, of *testimony*, to be judged on the established principles of evidence, and then of *physiology;* but neither of theology nor of morals. Some few human beings are wont to walk in their sleep; and during the continuance of profound slumber they perform with precision and safety, the offices of common life, and return to their beds, and yet are totally unconscious when they awake of what they have done. Now, in considering this, or any such extraordinary class of facts, our business is, in the first place, to obtain a number of instances supported by the distinct and unimpeachable testimony of intelligent witnesses, and then being thus in possession of facts, to adjust them as well as we

can, to other parts of the philosophy of human nature. Shall we allow an objector to put a check to our scientific curiosity on the subject, for instance, of somnambulism, by saying, 'Scores of these accounts have turned out to be exaggerated or totally untrue,' or, 'This walking in our sleep ought not to be thought possible, or as likely to be permitted by the Benevolent Guardian of human welfare?'" The claims of the subject, then, demand an earnest, philosophical hearing. The issue involved—whether or not we have *phenomenal* proof of a life beyond the grave—is of too serious importance to Christian knowledge to permit us to throw aside the inquiry as simply curious, or at the most purely speculative in its character. This is not our permanent dwelling-place; we do not live for the present alone. Aspirations have been implanted in our natures, which find their realization only in a loftier sphere of being, and that which brings home to our consciousness glimpses of the morning sunshine that is to cheer the pilgrim when he has reached his journey's end, is an element of spiritual progress something more than an idle dream.

Another consideration urges the claims of pneumatology to the thoughtful study of the Christian searcher after truth. For the last twenty-five years, and especially in this country, the subject in its artificial phase has deeply seized upon popular sympathy. Various phenomena which occur as the result of calculated method, manifestations superinduced through what is called mediumship, are religiously looked upon by millions throughout the civilized world as communications from an ultra-mundane sphere. The belief is by no means confined to zealous enthusiasts. During the hundred years it had exhibited itself in Germany, it had enlisted in its cause some of the most distinguished philosophers and *savans*. It has spread in this country with almost lightning rapidity, assuming new and startling forms, and establishing itself in the conviction of at least ten millions of people. It has diffused itself through all ranks and professions of men, many of whom pursue their investigations in private, and disclose their opinions only to sympathizing friends. A writer in the Westminster Review, a periodi-

cal which will surely not be accused of any tendency to over-estimate the significance of the movement, says: "We should be in much error if we suppose that table turning, or that group of asserted phenomena which in this country is embodied under that name, and which in America assumes the loftier title of Spiritualism, in ceasing to occupy the attention of the public generally, has also ceased to occupy the attention of every part of it. The fact is very much otherwise. Our readers would be astonished were we to lay before them the names of several of those who are unflinching believers in it, or who are devoting themselves to the study or reproduction of its marvels. Not only does it survive, but survives with all the charm and all the stimulating attractiveness of a secret science. Until the public mind of England shall be prepared to receive it, or until the evidence is put in shape to enforce general conviction, the present policy is to nurse it in quiet, and enlarge the circle of its influence by a system of noiseless extension. Whether this policy will be successful remains to be seen; but there can be no doubt, that, should ever the time arrive for the revival of the movement, the persons at its head would be men and women whose intellectual qualifications are known to the public, and who possess its confidence and esteem."

Nor will it solve the difficulty by treating Spiritualism as a superstitious epidemic, originating when the "Rochester knockings" were first brought to public attention, treating its votaries to a new dispensation, exhibiting manifestations which it had been the good fortune of no other age to witness, and destined to pass away like all other ephemeral delusions.

> "For this is not a matter of to-day,
> Or yesterday, but hath been from all time,
> And none hath told us whence it comes, or how."

The belief in the interposition of spirits in human affairs, has been the inheritance of the human race. Its influence has been more widely spread than civilization itself. True, America inaugurated a new era by giving expression to spiritual communication through mediumship; it has brought

the spirit-world a step nearer to our firesides. But the dogma of ethereal companionship—of spirit-vision, of the knowledge of coming events from inhabitants of another world—we find obtaining from the Creation to Christ; the ancient Vedas are aglow with it; the Zend Avesta proclaims it; the fathers of the Church affirmed it as part of their heritage. Even the use of the alphabet in conversing with spirits, was in familiar use by Numa Pompilius, and notoriously so in the reign of the Roman Emperor Valens.*

We wish not to be understood as implying belief in the exaggerated claims of American spiritualism. It would not fall within the proper treatment of our subject—the objective reality of apparitions. We simply deprecate the bad odor in which the subject is held, and the taboo which the unlettered place upon investigations of that sort. Coleridge says: "There are errors which no wise man will treat with rudeness, while there is a probability that they may be the refraction of some great truth as yet below the horizon." Here, then, is an order of phenomena, that no psychology, no theology have as yet explained. Mixed up with fanaticism and imposture, they undoubtedly are, as are all facts professing to reach beyond the grave; but nevertheless, *facts*, needing to be grappled with closely, lest if allowed to spread among us without direction and explanation from the learned, they plant ineradicably the seeds of sinister superstition and plunge us into an ocean of mystery. It is no objection that in the investigation of facts claimed by many to be manifestations of ultramundane agencies, we are met by charlatanry and abuse. No person, unless directed by the most zealous bigotry, would think of holding Protestantism responsible for the excesses and atrocities of the Anabaptists. Nor, believing that science will ultimately include them within the operation of natural laws as yet unknown, should we sneer at those who seek therein a spiritual presence, bringing intelligence, joy,

---

* Howitt's History of the Supernatural, vol. 2, p. 193.

and cheer from the life beyond the vail.* The line of demarcation between the natural and the supernatural is not so broad, that we can always determine whether facts, apparently marvellous, are within the one or the other. The fact is only rendered more important that it is the part of wisdom and manliness to promote investigation, sedulously accurate and impartial, lest we exclude the explaining light of man's immortality, that would illuminate our wavering faith into a living knowledge of the truth.

There is a phase of irreligion now in vogue which would restrict attention exclusively to secular affairs, and physical studies. Content with the freedom of to-day, it has no thought of the morrow. It would attend alone to the concerns of that existence which is certain and immediate, and not waste its energies in preparation for a future life, the reality of which, to their minds, is susceptible of *some* degree of doubt. This is virtually the creed of a large mass of people. They envelop in gloomy doubts the higher truths of Christianity; they carry with them through life a faith inanimate and barren. Scriptural testimony has failed to convince them that when the dark curtain closes on earthly scenes and happiness, it opens the portals of a diviner life. They require different proof—evidence cognizable with their own senses, if it may be. Should not the mere instinct of self-preservation, then, against the secularism of modern times, restrain us from prejudging the inquiry by scouting at spirit-visitation as an impossibility? Phenomena, which as happening to-day, are rejected without investigation as incredible, will be rejected as incredible happening eighteen hundred years ago. In steering clear of superstition, we may be denying realities which would strengthen the feeble belief of many a doubting Thomas. We may be placing in the hands of Strauss and Renan, their most powerful weapons of assault. We may be ignoring much-needed influences, coming to us like monitor voices from the

* See the *Popular Science Review* for July, 1871, giving an account of experiments made with the celebrated medium Home, by the editor, Mr. Crooks, F. R. S., and other scientists.

beautiful Beyond—from a realm, better, brighter, and of a nobler type, where may be realized the loftiest aspirations of earth.

This, we hope, may serve as a fitting apology for the subject. We now propose to inquire whether apparitions of the dead do at times appear; whether they possess objective reality, or whether they are the mere conjured images of an overwrought imagination; whether the belief in the occasional reappearance of departed spirits involves any absurd postulate in metaphysical or psychological science. It is needless to remark that we must pursue strictly the inductive method. Closet speculation cannot decide the question. We must, in the first instance, collect the phenomena; for these exist independently of any explanation. The theorist, making his own knowledge the test of probability, might for a life-time pronounce that such a contravention of Nature was *impossible*, or perhaps *ought* not to be, short of a direct miracle from God. It would be equally a miracle, we apprehend, if by such intellectual arrogance he should stumble upon the truth. By what superior wisdom does he assume to decide that he knows *all* of God's laws? He gropes about in the present; his means of knowledge are circumscribed; Nature is continually unfolding to his intelligence new laws, new combinations, new conditions. History in every page, proclaims against such presumption. "In proportion to the difficulty there seems to be in admitting phenomena," says a scientific writer, "should be the scrupulous attention we bestow on their examination." Nature is crowded with seeming miracles; the instincts and modes of life of birds, the transformation of insects, the tenacity of life in reptiles, are all instances of marvelous powers in nature, which, at one time or other, met with persistent denial from those whose duty it was to demonstrate and develop them. It is not to such that we look as the pioneers of knowledge. It is to the unprejudiced, often the uneducated, whose faith is not paralyzed, who have the capacity of admitting new truths upon well attested evidence, who use their own eyes, and throw aside the spectacles of learned men.

Space will not permit us to give even a few of the narratives of apparitions vouched for from the earliest times to the present. We might accumulate a mass of evidence from every age and people, which it would require volumes to contain.* In fact, at the first mention of the subject, there is scarcely a household but has its facts and knowledge of this kind. Many of them, it is true, come to us as legendary waifs and strays; others are authenticated by the experience of credible witnesses, acknowledged to be sincere, and known to the world as capable. Dr. Wilkinson says in his Life of Swedenborg: "The lowest experience of all times is rife in spiritual intercourse already; man believes it in his fears and hopes, even when his education is against it; almost every family has its legends; and nothing but wanting courage to divulge them keeps back this supernaturalism from forming a library of itself."

If we cannot accept testimony coming from the most reputable sources, from eye-witnesses who placed their experience at the time on record, where there could be no motive for simulation, where the opportunities for observing were ample, coming from divergent sources through all time, upon what sure foundation can the verity of historical fact rest? A mass of evidence might be collected—vouched for by witnesses of such respectability and celebrity as Oberlin, Wesley, Lord Lyttleton, Erskine, and others—which surely no right-minded person, whose faith is not cramped by intellectual prejudice, would for a moment hesitate to believe. The Cambridge Society,

---

* The following passage is from the preface to the *Prayers and Meditations* of Dr. Samuel Johnson. "The improbability arising from rarity of occurrence or singularity of nature amounts to no disproof; it is a presumptive reason of doubt too feeble to withstand the conviction induced by positive credible testimony, such as has been borne to shadowy reappearances of the dead. To a mind not influenced by popular prejudice, it will be scarcely deemed possible to believe that apparitions would have been vouched for in all countries, had they never been seen in any."

Addison's opinion is contained in the Spectator in these words: "I think a person who is thus terrified with the imagination of ghosts and spectres much more reasonable than one who, contrary to the reports of all historians, sacred and profane, ancient and modern, and to the traditions of all nations, thinks the appearance of spirits fabulous and groundless. Could I not give myself up to the general testimony of mankind, I should to the relations of particular persons who are now living, and whom I cannot distrust in other matters of fact."

composed of Fellows of the University, and formed for the purpose of investigating phenomena claiming to be extra-natural, report that they believe the appearance of apparitions a settled fact. We must therefore, for lack of space, abridge our discussion by claiming assent to this proposition: that in all ages and in all countries, shadowy somethings, popularly called *ghosts*, have appeared to men, which to all appearances were external and real. Whether such spiritual appearances are what they seem to the beholders to be, namely, objectively real; or whether they are partly real and partly illusive; or whether they are wholly the projections of an excited fancy, we do not propose at this stage to affirm or deny.*

Now, as universal as has been the testimony of the world that these phenomena occur, is the inborn belief of mankind, that the visible and physical world stands in close relationship to the world of spirits; and that the denizens of the latter do, at times and under certain conditions, make themselves visibly manifest to such whose spiritual vision is not closed by fleshly and worldly obstructions. We may reject it as a superstition or accept it as a dogma, yet the tendency remains as a great law of humanity. Commence with the earliest nations, amid all their darkness and corruptions, and descend in chronological order through the whole of antiquity, and you will inevitably find this bright line of primal and substantial truth, running as unerringly as the needle guides the traveler through a pathless desert. Darkly apprehended we find it in many cases, but yet as indestructible as the human soul itself. It is the fountain source of all mystery, wonder, and superstition, as well as of all higher truth. It does not resolve itself simply into that secret power of nature to attribute to ultra-mundane agency, effects which are but feebly understood as the product of physical causes. We may accept the truth of this tendency as a historical fact; yet whence is the first projection of this ineradicable faith in spirit visitation? It springs

* Such as are desirous of reading reliable narratives of apparitions, we refer to Robert Dale Owen's new work, "*The Debatable Land*, &c." Also an excellent little work by Catharine Crowe, "*Night Side of Nature.*"

up at every step of his progress; he feels it to be indispensable to his interior life. While no depth of savage degradation can extinguish it, neither can any advancement towards the highest civilization purge it from the human mind.

We find it giving consistency and vitality to every ancient creed. Confucius, who represents the early faith of China, taught that heaven and earth, the world of matter and the world of spirit, and the whole order of nature constitute but one empire, governed by the same eternal reason. That we are in constant *rapport* with the spirits of the departed; that they exercise a vigilant guardianship over our affairs, reading our inmost thoughts, and recording all our actions. Travelers inform us that the same notions of spirit life obtain to this day among the Chinese. In the Sagas of Scandinavia, ghost-belief is prominent upon every page. So among the Brahmins of India, in the mythological system of Zoroaster, and in the ancient Druidical faith, the contiguity of the spirit world stands forth like light and darkness, producing blessings and monstrosities.

Among no people do we find this intuitive recognition of a substantial truth more pronounced than among the ancient Greeks. Their philosophy, their poetry, their art, all attest its irresistible potence. Socrates, we are forced to believe, had veritably an attendant spirit, without the guidance of which, he would never have attained the recognition of truths, which we, twenty-three centuries later, scarcely admit. It was the existence of apparitions that led the Greek philosophers to speculate on the nature of departed spirits. Some endeavored to explain them away, by asserting that people confounded the creations of their fancy with realities. Others, as Democritus, explained them as a species of permanent beings, superior to men, but not possessed of souls.

In more modern times, even when the flood-gates of rationalism seemed to threaten the utter destruction of supernatural belief, we find this eternal principle making itself felt, like the pent-up gases of the earth's interior. Kant, whose ambition in philosophy it was to establish God upon the throne of Aris-

totelian logic, who aimed an "Essay on the Disorders of the Head" at what he considered the frenzy and madness of Swedenborg, is forced to admit: "I know just as little how the spirit of man goes out of this world, as how it came in. In fact, I do not even know how I am present in this world; that is, how an immaterial nature can be in a body and acting through it. And this very ignorance warns me not to reject all truth in the numerous narratives of apparitions, yet with the usual, but ludicrous reservation, of *doubting them in every case, and believing them all in the lump.*" We might thus show that the belief in the earthly ministration of disembodied souls has been a factor of human intelligence, operating under every variety of circumstance; and that "those who deny it with their tongues, confess it in their fears." It is one of those fixed and ungovernable instincts that exert themselves in utter contempt of learned philosophies and creeds. It is a birth-right for which man's nature, not his education, is responsible. It can no more be repressed by any process of mental petrifaction, than can the underswelling flood beneath the frozen surface of ice-covered rivers.

Verily, our instincts are too little studied. They are the truest part of our nature, and contain its most valued wisdom. They indicate "the divinity that stirs within us;" they never long for that, for which God does not furnish a corresponding adaptation.* In no classes of people are they more asserting,

---

* Say, where full Instinct is th' unerring guide,
What Pope or Council can they need beside?
Reason, however able, cool at best,
Cares not for service, or but serves when press'd;
Stays till we call, and then not often near;
But honest Instinct comes a volunteer;
Sure never to o'ershoot, but just to hit,
While still too wide or short is human wit;
Sure by quick nature, happiness to gain,
Which heavier Reason labors at in vain.
This, too, serves always, Reason never long,
One must go right, the other may go wrong;
See then the acting and comparing powers,
One in their nature, which are two in ours;
And Reason raise o'er Instinct as you can,
In this 'tis God directs, in that 'tis man.—*Pope.*

and less dimmed by educational perversity, than in women and children; and in none do we find correspondingly the same awe-shadowings and dread of spectral appearances. It was the Jewish women who attended the earthly pilgrimage of Christ as His most earnest disciples. It was they who washed His feet with tears, and believed most eagerly in the divinity of His mission. Not because they possess more vulgar credulity, but more receptivity and faith; because they are more responsive to the electric touch of intuition, and speak from the recesses of a heart much nearer heaven than ours. We argue, then, that the belief in apparitions could not have impressed itself so universally upon the human mind, did it not have a substantive truth to feed upon; nor would the intuitive side of our nature respond so unmistakably to such belief, did there not exist some corresponding actuality to call it forth. Dr. Good in his lecture on Materialism and Immaterialism, says on this point:* "From what remote source universal tradition may have derived this common idea of disembodied spirits, I pretend not to ascertain; the inquiry would, nevertheless, be curious, and might be rendered important; it is a pleasing subject, and imbued with that tender melancholy that peculiarly befits it for a mind of sensibility and fine taste. Its universality, independently of the sanction afforded to it by revealed religion, is no small presumption of its being founded on fact."

Assuming it as a fact that apparitions have existed in all ages, and leaving out of view the intuitive dread in which mankind has ever held them as being reappearances of the dead, let us inquire whether they cannot otherwise be accounted for. Are they not the mere phantasmagoria of "expectant attention," or conjured images such as rack the brain of the hasheesh eater or the opium chewer?

There can be no doubt that, in many cases, these appearances are hallucinations of the mind, or excited conceptions resulting from morbid sensibility of the retina of the eye, superabun-

---

* *Book of Nature.* Page 331.

dance of blood, hysteria, and inflammation of the brain. A leading case of that kind is that of Nicolai, a bookseller of Berlin, and naturally a person of excitable imagination. The following is the account in his own words: "My wife and another person came into my apartment in the morning, in order to console me, but I was too much agitated by a series of accidents, which had most powerfully affected my moral feeling, to be capable of attending to them. On a sudden, I perceived, at about the distance of ten steps, a form like that of a deceased person. I pointed at it, asking my wife if she did not see it. It was but natural that she should not see anything; my question, therefore, alarmed her very much, and she immediately sent for a physician. The phantom continued for about eight minutes. I grew at length more calm, and being extremely exhausted, fell into a restless sleep, which lasted about half an hour. The physician ascribed the apparition to a violent mental emotion, and hoped there would be no return; but the violent agitation of my mind had in some way disordered my nerves, and produced further consequences, which deserve a more minute description. At four in the afternoon, the form which I had seen in the morning reappeared. I was by myself when this happened, and being rather uneasy at the incident, went to my wife's apartment; but there likewise I was persecuted by the apparition, which, however, at intervals disappeared, and always presented itself in a standing posture. About six o'clock there appeared also several walking figures, which had no connection with the first. After the first day the form of the deceased person no more appeared, but its place was supplied with many other phantoms, sometimes representing acquaintances, but mostly strangers; those whom I knew were composed of living and deceased persons, but the number of the latter was comparatively small. I observed the persons with whom I daily conversed, did not appear as phantoms; these representing chiefly persons who lived at some distance from me."

Intense mental conceptions may impress themselves so strongly upon the mind as to become apparently real exist-

ences. The following, taken from Abercrombie, illustrates the case: A gentleman was told of the sudden death of an old and intimate friend, and was deeply affected by it. The impression, though partially banished by the business of the day, was renewed from time to time by conversing on the subject with his family and other friends. After supper he went by himself to walk in a small court behind his house, which was bounded by extensive gardens. The sky was clear, and the night serene, and no light was falling upon the court from any of the windows. As he walked down stairs, he was not thinking of anything connected with his deceased friend; but when he had proceeded at a slow pace about half way across the court, the figure of his friend started up before him in a most distinct manner at the opposite angle of the Court. The narrator then mentions the indescribable feeling which shot through his frame; but he soon recovered himself, and walked briskly up to the spot, keeping his eyes intently fixed upon the spectre. As he approached the spot, it vanished, not by sinking into the ground, but seeming to melt insensibly into air.

These, and many similar instances, are cases of mere hallucination, which any diseased or abnormal state of the human organization may exhibit. But there is this important fact to be considered in connection with these deceptions of the sense; they are in every case *individual* deceptions. Such is necessarily the case. They are the phantasmagoria of a partial insanity—the projections of an over-excited fancy running in an abnormal channel; but the phantasms flitting through the mind exist only for the person thus afflicted, while to all others they are "airy nothings." The images that haunted the morbid senses of Nicolai were invisible to his friends; only Petrarch could discern the spectral shadow of Laura approaching him; only Brutus could hear the sepulchral voice of Cæsar's ghost. There are instances on record of collected *illusions*. These may be easily accounted for; they consist simply in an incorrect report by the senses of what really exists; and we may easily conceive how a phenomenon, calculated to mislead the

senses of an individual, may just as well impose upon the senses of a multitude. But with hallucination the case is different; and in the absence of any authenticated instance of collective hallucination, it is safe to assert: that whenever two beings (they may be both human, or the one may be of the brute creation, which makes the case still stronger) perceive simultaneously the same phenomenon, there *must* be an objective existence, in some phase or other, to awaken that perception. The fancy *may* project upon the phenomenon details which are not actually part of it; it may make it material to the touch, or audible to the ear, and so far perceive it in part subjectively; but there is an outward presence there, be it what it may, with which the observers are confronted, and their fancy set at work.

Apply this reasoning to a single case reported many years ago, in the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal.* The following remarks of the reviewer are remarkable, as representing a profession, that would readily seize hold of any explanation rather than acknowledge that it contained any element of the extra-natural: "This is almost the only recorded case known to us where the evidence is so strong as to leave no other impression on the mind but that it was the appearance of some supernatural agency, and, after having in vain endeavored to explain it on any other supposition, we found ourselves forced to conclude with Hamlet, that 'there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy.' The story, vouched for by the most accredited authority, is given by the reviewer as follows:

"F. M. S. was passing through the Wolfridge wood at Alverston one night at twelve o'clock. He was accompanied by his dog, of a breed between a Newfoundland and mastiff, a powerful animal, who feared neither man nor beast. He had a fowling piece, and a pair of pistols loaded, besides his sword, for he belonged to the Military School there, and had been out for a day's shooting.

"The road ran centrally through the wood; and very nearly in the centre of the road, at a part somewhat more open than

the rest, there was a cross erected to point out the spot where a gamekeeper had been murdered. The place had the reputation of being haunted, and the ghost, it was said, had been repeatedly seen. S—— had frequently before passed this cross in the wood without seeing anything, and treated the story of the ghost so lightly that he had, on more occasions than one, for a bet, gone there at midnight and returned, meeting nothing except an occasional gamekeeper or poacher.

"This night, when he approached the open space in the wood, he thought he perceived, at the other end of that space, the form of a man, more indistinct, however, than usual. He called his dog to his side, (for previously it had been ranging about, barking furiously, and giving chase to the game it started), patted it on the head to make it keep a sharp look-out, and cocked his gun. The dog, on this, was all impatience. S—— challenged the figure, but no answer was returned. Suspecting it was a poacher, and prepared for an encounter, he directed the dog's attention to the appearance, and the animal answered by growling. He then kept his eye steadily fixed on the figure; when instantly it glided within arm's length of him. Still he looked steadily in its face, while it kept his eyes on him. It had approached him without noise or rustling. The face was ill-defined, but distinctly visible.

"He could not turn his eyes from those of this apparition; they fascinated him, as it were, to the spot; he had no power in his frame. He felt no sense of bodily injury, only a certain indescribable sense of awe. So fascinated were his eyes by those of the figure, that he did not observe its dress, nor even its form. It looked calmly and with a mild aspect, for a space of time which he does not think exceeded half a minute; then suddenly became invisible. The form had flitted before him about five minutes altogether.

"The dog, which before this was furious and growling, now stood crouched at his feet as if in a trance—his jaw fallen, his limbs quivering, and his whole frame agitated and covered with a cold sweat. After the form disappeared, S—— touched the animal, then spoke to it without its seeming to recognize him;

and it was some time before it appeared to recover its senses. The whole way home it never moved from his side, but kept close to his feet; nor on their way home did it run after game, or take notice if game started near it.

"It was a fortnight before it recovered from the fright, and it was never afterwards the same lively animal. No consideration would ever induce that dog to enter the wood after nightfall, nor would it allow any of the family to enter it. When it was forced to pass by the open spot in daylight, it would only do so with its master; and it always exhibited signs of fear, trembling all the time, and walking silently by his side."

How are we to dispose of such a case upon any theory of hallucination or expectancy? Not surely by denying the facts, which are vouched for by a skeptical witness, in a medical journal of established reputation. Such would be a short cut to unbelief, that might perhaps satisfy the vulgar lack of earnestness in many minds; but it would fail to solve the difficulty with candid inquirers. Other equally well-attested cases might be adduced;* but surely the rarity of these occurrences cannot be employed as an argument against the theory, that when the disembodied spirit of man passes to another state of existence, it still has human sympathies stronger than death, and may occasionally make itself perceptible to living persons. Yet, with the stereotyped religionist, such belief is profane delusion; with the stereotyped literary man, it is all fancy; with the stereotyped scientist, it is sheer imposture, and with the generality of people, it is all infatuation and nonsense. Rather than accept the simplest explanation in conformity with the facts—an explanation which, we think, entails no absurd inferences in psychological or theological science—we rack our feeble brains with learned vagaries, the like of which the human mind never efore conceived.

Take, as an apt illustration, the theory of Dr. Rogers. The German naturalist, Reichenbach,† claims to have discovered a

* We are indebted for the foregoing narrative, as well as others of a like character, to Owen's late work, "*The Debatable Land*, &c."

† Der Sensitive Mensch. Stuttgart, 1854.

subtle fluid in nature called *odyle*, which, in certain persons, possessed of a corresponding *sensitivity*, exhibits peculiar powers in modifying the action of the brain. He reckons the number of sensitives—such as are susceptible to odic sensations, whether of sight, smell, touch or sound—as one-half the human race. Dr. Rogers at once announced the theory, that in certain persons possessed of this sensitivity, the odic fluid has the effect of suspending the controlling power of the mind over the brain, and thus leave the latter free to the control of mundane powers.* The mind is placed in a sort of dormant state, which leaves the brain free to what he calls "reflex cerebral action;" and thus "mundane influences" are thrown upon it, and reflected, as from a mirror, in the shape of hobgoblins and shadows, but which are really the phantoms of a brain thus biologized and self-acting. He says, "It is a remarkable fact, that when the brain and nervous system are brought into the above-named condition, the odic flame or vapor, at the point to which the nervous system has this strong relation, will assume the human form, and will have its action repeated there, as if the living being were present, instead of its ghost." Such, we are to believe, is science—aught else, superstition! Superstition, indeed, far more fertilizing than what some men esteem as the truth.

We must again remind ourselves of the remark of Isaac Taylor, that this is primarily "a question of *testimony*, to be judged upon the established rules of evidence." We do not mean that it is a matter wholly foreign to biblical interpretation; but that we must not, in the first instance, go to the inspired writers for the decision of this, or of any question of pneumatology. The Scriptures within their legitimate province convey truth, and only truth; yet truth not in the abstract, but only under a special aspect, and as defining some immediate duty. It was not the province of the inspired writers to unfold the truth in universal terms, and the incidental allusions thrown out here

---

* Philosophy of Mysterious Agents, or the Dynamic Laws and Relations of Man. E. C. Rogers, 1853.

and there as to the state of man after death, while they will never, if rightly interpreted, lead us astray, yet are not sufficient to stay the philosophic mind in what is strictly a subject of scientific curiosity. Men no longer go to the Hebrew text for the processes and successive orders of creation, although they contradict nothing which our physical science has conclusively established; neither with like propriety should we depend upon them for the ultimate decision of any psychological or metaphysical question. Yet, although we cannot with reason expect to find the abstract truth within their inspired pages, we should avail ourselves of their guidance in pursuing any inquiry, however distantly related to the principles of religion.

The learned Apostle, St. Paul, tells us, "there is a natural body, and there is a *spiritual* body." First, the natural, subject to the chemical laws which operate upon matter when life becomes extinct,—and then the spiritual, which is not dependent upon animal organization, but which rises from the ashes of our *gross* corporeity, and passes into another state of existence. The natural body is not the life, or animating presence; neither is the spiritual body the ultimate intelligence; but both serve as the necessary media through which the soul, which is pure spirit, exercises its faculties. We have no reason to believe that the soul ever exists in a purely *unembodied* state. In fact, metaphysically speaking, we cannot conceive of *pure* spirit, except in the person of the Godhead, who is the Absolute Spirit. The tendency of spirit is always towards corporeity and embodiment. Hence we have taught by St. Paul the physiological fact, that man has two species of corporeity: the one grossly material and dissoluble; the other of a more refined nature, endowed with higher powers, unencumbered with flesh and blood, yet still corporeal. The change at death is simply the casting off the material vestments of the soul, and the entrance of the embodied soul upon full consciousness of the spirit world.

Of the nature and properties of the spiritual body, Scripture teaches us nothing definite; but there is little hazard involved in saying that it will exhibit no less divine skill than the

one from which the soul disengages itself at death; rather that it will be marked by a higher excellence and greater plasticity. We have every reason to believe, too, that it will preserve the same assemblage of features and configuration of parts, which identified the natural body when upon the earth. In other words, that it will be the *eidolon* of the dead form in which the soul corporealizes itself after death. We can in a manner illustrate by an experiment described by Paracelsus. Take a flower, which, separated from its parent stem, has perished; burn it. The elements of matter that composed the flower when living, are dispersed; they can never be re-collected and combined. And yet out of the ashes of the flower, by a chemical process, you can raise a perfect spectrum of what the flower was in life.* May this not furnish an analogy for the formative process, the result of which is the spiritual body, by which the soul assumes corporeity, the moment the death change arrests our physical life?

If the soul thus embodied is to survive "the muddy vesture of decay" with which on earth it is burdened (and there is nothing in the Bible or Christianity that forbids us to believe it) it is reasonable to expect that it will not at once be consigned to its final doom; but that there will be an intermediate state after death, during which the soul will retain its individuality, its sympathies, and its general habit of thought. Death is not such a transforming change as to permit the spirit of man to become suddenly either a glorified angel or a sinner damned. In God's visible economy we find no metamorphosis that is not preceded by gradual progress; we find no sudden leaps; all is illustrative of continuity; all is progressive change and connected succession. *Natura non fecit saltum.* It is a violent destruction of the analogies which God's great Book furnishes upon every page, to suppose that the departed spirit

---

* This is the Alchemist's doctrine of *palingenesis*, or the resuscitation of the interior spiritual form of flowers. It was built on one of those dim perceptions, which have obtained in all tradition—that plants have an underlying spiritual life. Disraeli gives an account of Palingenesis in his Curiosities of Literature, under the head of "Dreams at the Dawn of Philosophy."

at once enters upon a state either of ineffable bliss or burning torment. Such would be a thorough revolution of his thoughts and feelings, for which his "threescore years and ten" would but ill prepare him. Man while upon earth, however great his virtues, however loathsome his sins, is entirely fit neither for heaven nor hell. He reaches here neither the acme of his perfection nor the extremity of his degradation. He makes character by advances that are almost imperceptible—by the slow expansion of his intellectual and moral powers, by the constant exercise of motives, by the slow-working agency of circumstances. Is it irrational, then, to believe that the unbroken Chain of Nature will extend beyond the vail into the invisible world of spirits?

We mention the probability of an intermediate state * to clear away the time-worn objection which our grandmothers before us used against the possibility of the dead returning; which sent them in the twinkling of an eye either to heaven, from whence they *would* not return, or to hell, from whence they *could* not. The astronomic universe may be a mere speck lying in the bosom of another universe—thinly veiled, but real —which after the river of life is crossed, stands waiting to welcome us to its hospitable shores.

> "For this life is but being's first faint ray,
> And heaven on heaven make up God's dazzling day."

Perchance, the soul after death may have the freedom of the universe. The immensity of space between the stars, where we imagine nonenity reigns, may be the beautiful temple where worshipful angels delight to tread. Those seeming abysses of vacuity may be the kingdom of other ranks of spiritual existence, whose noiseless rustling start us, like dreamlike thoughts, in moments of stillness.

Having thus prepared the way upon theological grounds, the real question remains to be answered—how is it possible, psychologically, for the dead to manifest themselves to the liv-

---

* Whether, or not, it is a state of progression is not material to the argument; unless by denying that there is progression there, we affirm that the soul after death subsides into a state of entire unconsciousness. (*παννίχια*).

ing? Is it permitted unto man to see spiritual things? Can he see aught but the material, the tangible, the perishable? Not certainly, with his ordinary vision, which, says Bacon, "carrieth a resemblance with the sun, which openeth and revealeth the terrestrial globe, but covereth and concealeth the stars and celestial globe. So doth the eye discover natural things, but darken and shut up divine." But suppose it were possible for the soul to be lifted partially out of the body, and its normal relations with the body to be modified, would its vision be not in a corresponding degree spiritualized, and opened to intelligences which the natural eye shuts out? Would it not come *en rapport* with any spiritual presence that might be hovering about it? Theologians teach us that this state of *extase*, this disjoining of body and soul, this sublimated vision consequent upon a partial escape of the soul from the animal organization that weighs it down, is the secret of all prophecy and inspiration. It is the inspiration of genius, much talked of and little understood; it was that which impelled a Greek schoolmaster three thousand years ago, to write a poem which has stood the critical test of ages, and called forth the admiration of the whole world. The phenomena of animal magnetism by which something similar to this extatic state can be artificially induced, show how loose the bonds of union may become between soul and body; and how the patient acquires new perceptions, as the soul disengages itself from the natural body. If the trance is too prolonged, it may even result in death. An instance is given by a French magnetizer, of two somnambules—the one, a boy, Bruno, the other, a girl, Adele —with whom he was experimenting simultaneously. After having thrown Adele in the magnetic trance, his attention was withdrawn from her for some time, while operating with the boy. The rest is in his own words: "In that short time her body had become almost icy cold; I could detect neither pulse nor respiration; her face was of a yellowish green, her lips blue, the heart gave no sign of life. A mirror which I applied to her lips remained undimmed. I magnetized her with my utmost force, hoping to revive her; but during five min-

utes without any effect whatever. Bruno and several persons, who were assisting me at the sitting, added by their terror to my discomfiture; and for a moment, I thought the soul, in very deed, had left its body. I begged all present to pass into the next room, so as to recover my energy; but, though hope still lingered, I felt powerless. Throwing myself on my knees, I implored God not to suffer that soul, a victim of my doubts, to pass away. After a brief period of anguish, I heard the low words: 'Why did you recall me? It was all but done, when God, touched by your prayer, sent me back.'"

Such, too, has been the experience of persons who by disease of any kind have been thrown into a trance-like state. While their natural bodies had ceased to perform every function of life, their heart ceased to pulsate, their respiration exhausted, yet the soul hovered consciously among the assembled mourners, and looked down with an inner vision upon its own motionless corpse. These are physiological facts; and their plain inference is, that the normal adjustment of body and soul is capable, either by disease, by special Providence, or by natural idiosyncrasy, of such modification as permits the soul to recede from its animal organization, and thus, we infer, become cognizant of spiritual phenomena which the natural eye excludes. "And Elisha prayed and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw"—what previously Elisha only had seen. Animals, especially horses and dogs, we have every reason to believe, are thus spiritually perceptive; perhaps more so than men, for their consciousness is merged deeper in the general life of nature.

This, we humbly believe, removes all psychological difficulties in the way of accepting the theory, that the disembodied (not *un*embodied) spirits of the dead are under rare circumstances seen by the denizens of this world. Space will not permit us to amplify; but enough, we hope, has been suggested to define how far their real *objectivity* extends. Objective, indeed, they are, no other explanation will reconcile the facts, but objective only so far that there is a *spiritual presence*

confronting the observer. This spiritual entity is capable of being perceived, whenever, by any cause, the soul of the observer is, as it were, segregated from its earthly incumbrance, and made thus receptive of phases of knowledge which escape its ordinary intelligence. We cannot well conceive how the attributes of tangibility and audibility can belong to this presence; but we readily understand how the fancy, the image-making power of the mind, which is always excitedly at work during the continuance of the extatic state, may project them, as well as other details upon the phenomenon. So far the apparition is purely subjective; but this subjectivity has a basis in fact; it is not spontaneous; it is called forth by the veritable presence of a spiritual being, issuing from the daylight splendor of another world.

And yet the theme, however pleasing, impresses upon us the cautionary words of Dr. Good, "that in the abstract subject before us, nothing is so becoming as humility; that we have no pole star to direct us, no clue to unriddle the perplexities of the labyrinth in which we are wandering; that every step is doubtful, and that to expatiate is perhaps only to lose ourselves." The light is imperfect; yet everywhere bright lines of truth shine forth to illuminate and foster our spiritual growth; a presaging voice speaks within us, whose utterings incite to higher resolves and more benevolent actions. It tells us that the spirit world is near to our souls.

> "There was a time when *all mankind*
> Did listen with a faith sincere
> To tuneful tongues in mystery versed."

Shall *we* be listeners, or shall we stifle its cheering voice, and glorify our Sadducism into a triumph over superstition?

Art. X.—BOOK NOTICES.

Systematic Theology. By Charles Hodge, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner and Company. London and Edinburg: T. Nelson & Sons. 1872.

We have not been favored with the first volume of this work, and therefore our judgment of the work as a whole, must be made up from the second volume. The first two volumes have been before the public for some time, and have received favorable notice. This notice in the Presbyterian Church, to which the venerable author belongs, has been highly flattering. It is but natural that it should be so. Dr. Hodge has labored as professor in the Princeton Theological Seminary for fifty years. This work is the fruit of his maturest judgment and life-long study. It has the merit of being strictly orthodox according to the faith of the Old School Presbyterian Church. This faith for the author is as complete a standard of orthodoxy for theology as the Bible is for faith. It is assumed throughout that the Westminster Confession is the faith of the true Catholic Church of all ages, and its full and complete agreement with the teachings of the Bible is unquestioned. We presume the affirmative or positive portion of the work presents the lectures which Dr. Hodge has given to his students for many years, with scarcely any modification or change. The negative sections consist of statements and condemnations of all theories that have sprung up from age to age in conflict with the Presbyterian faith. All that was required, therefore, to bring the work up to the present time, was to state the latest views of theologians not in agreement with the author, and to pronounce them in conflict with the true faith of the Church and the Bible. This is in accordance with the author's view of theology, which he regards, not as a progressive science, but as settled and fixed for all time by the standards of the Presbyterian Church. There is a wonderful simplicity, and even *naïveté*, in the manner in which the author assumes everywhere in his work, that what he teaches is in every respect the teachings of the true Church of every age of history. It is considered sufficient, generally, to meet opposing views by the statement that they are condemned by the Bible and the Church. There is for him somewhere a line of succession in the Church, which in every age has taught just what he teaches, and to this he makes his appeal with as much unquestioning confidence as the Romanist appeals to the infallibility of the Pope. As a specimen of this sort of appeal, we select a passage from page 437, where the author sums up, in oppo-

sition to the different views of the person of Christ relating to the *Kenosis*. "The first remark to be made on this theory in all its forms, is that it is a departure from the faith of the Church. This objection turns up" (a great convenience certainly) "first on every occasion, because that is its proper place. If the Bible be the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and if the Bible be a plain book, and if the Spirit guides the people of God (not the external church, or the body of mere professing Christians) into the knowledge of the truth, then the presumption is invincible that what all true Christians believe to be the sense of Scripture is its sense." And this sets aside as false the views of such men as Ebrard, Gess, Dorner, Nevin, the Lutherans, the whole school of Schleiermacher, in short, all who do not explain the nature of the person of Christ as Dr. Hodge does. This is certainly *naïve*. We might ask how Dr. Hodge finds his invisible Church in order to make his appeal to its teaching. And if the Bible be a plain book, and if the Spirit guides the people of God into the correct knowledge of it in the sense implied, then these good men and great theologians, with whom the author differs, certainly cannot be the people of God. But let this suffice.

Dr. Hodge's work is a Biblical Theology, in distinction from a Scientific or Systematic Theology, though he styles it by the latter title. He regards philosophy as having nothing to do with theology, although he still finds it necessary to use it very frequently. On this account he sets aside the latest and best developments of German theology. "The *Vermittelungstheologie*, mediating theology, as it is called in Germany, is confessedly an attempt to combine the conclusions of modern speculation with Christian doctrine, or rather with Christianity. It is an attempt to mix incongruous elements which refuse to enter into combination. The modern speculative philosophy in all its forms insists on the denial of all real dualism, etc." This, it seems to us, is an unfortunate position. If philosophy and Christianity are incongruous, and refuse all combination, then Christianity is equally heterogeneous with the whole natural order, and the supernatural must stand *over* it, with no power ever to enter it. And this view carried out would lead to a denial of the possibility of the incarnation, as involving any real, internal, and organic union of the divine and human in the person of Christ.

How Dr. Hodge, venerable in years and mature in learning as he is acknowledged on all sides to be, can wave aside such a list of names (p. 731) as Schleiermacher, Ullmann, Nitzsch, Twesten, Martensen, Lange, Liebner, Dorner, Schoeberlein, Delitzsch, and many others, as giving to the world "writings which have the aspect of philosophical disquisitions, and not of exhibitions of Scriptural doctrines," we are puzzled to understand. He seems to think that the less a man concerns himself with philosophy, the better he is prepared to understand and expound the Scriptures.

But what astonishes us still more is the fact, that in his attempt

to set aside the best school of German theologians, who have done the noblest work against rationalists, Dr. Hodge brings forward these very rationalists, and quotes them as authority against these theologians, and that, too, without stating that his authorities are rank rationalists. Thus he quotes Schwarz against Dorner, p. 450, and the "German critics, Baur, Strauss, and Schwarz," against Schleiermacher. True, one may quote one errorist against another, but it would be expected that in such a case as this Dr. Hodge would be careful to state that such men as Baur, Strauss, and Schwarz, in their opposition to the mediating school of German theology are arrayed in the interest of rationalism and infidelity.

With such want of all appreciation of the best efforts of German theology, we were prepared to expect opposition also to Mercersburg theology. But we were not prepared for the unblushing misrepresentations which this volume contains. That Dr. Hodge has no sympathy with the latest developments of German philosophy, that he has very little interest in studying it, and that he would be likely to misapprehend any theology which employs German modes of thought, we can understand. But there is a recklessness in his references to Mercersburg theology, and his quotations from it, that stands in broad contrast with the truth-loving candor and honesty of German scholars in reference to their opponents. We can refer only to a few of these misrepresentations now. On page 429 he quotes Dr. Nevin as saying that Hegel's Christological ideas, "are very significant and full of instruction,"—that the objection that these principles are pantheistical, he (Dr. Nevin) pronounces "a mere sound without any force whatever."

This is quoted as from Dr. Nevin's "*Mystical Presence.*" It turns out that no such language can be found in that book. It is taken from an article in the *Mercersburg Review* of 1851 on *Liebner's Christology*, by Dr. Nevin. We will quote one of the passages as found in that article, leaving the reader to judge of the fairness or honesty of the above quotations. On page 58, where Dr. Nevin *is giving Liebner's view*, (not his own, although we have no doubt he would endorse it) he says: "In particular, the Christological ideas of this last" (Hegel) "are very significant and full of instruction; *for however monstrous they are in their own nature*, and contrary to the truth as it is in Christ, they still bear striking testimony to the great central fact of the gospel, by seeking to solve in another way the problem with which it is concerned; whilst they make it necessary for Christian science to go more deeply into its own truth, for the very purpose of bringing out clearly *its superiority to the false speculation so plausibly presented in its place.*" This is the way Dr. Nevin endorses Hegel's system!

On page 445 Dr. Hodge says, "this system" (Schleiermacher's) "makes Christ a mere man." Under this head he quotes from the "Mystical Presence" again, to show that Dr. Nevin "is abundant in his assertion of the *simple humanity* of Christ." "This also is the

staple of the *Mercersburg Review* in all its articles relating either to Anthropology or Soteriology." "There is nothing in Christ which does not belong to humanity." That Dr. Nevin or the Mercersburg theology ever questioned the divinity of Christ, or that their system involves anything looking most remotely in that way, will be news to those who have studied it at Mercersburg and Lancaster.

We might give other examples, but this must suffice for the present. We would like very much if this theology of Dr. Hodge could be generally read by our own ministers who have studied Mercersburg theology, for we feel quite sure that however dreary it is in itself, it would for this very reason prove a stimulus to turn to what, compared with it, is as a fresh, green landscape compared with a barren desert.

Dr. Hodge's theology belongs to an age gone by. That theology did a good work in its day, but it can nevermore be galvanized into life. The Presbyterian Church will take it to its heart with joy, but we are thankful that in our own Church we have escaped from this sort of bondage, and have been introduced into an order of theological thought where there is the spirit of enlargement and freedom.

Lange's Bible Commentary. The books of Joshua, Judges and Ruth. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1872.

The first book is by F. R. Fay, Pastor in Crefeld, Prussia, and translated by George R. Bliss, D. D., Professor in the University at Lewisburg, Penn. The second is by Paulus Cassel, D. D., Professor in Berlin, translated by P. H. Steenstra, Professor in Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. The third is by the same. It is not necessary to say anything concerning the merits of this extensive commentary, beyond the announcement of the volumes as they appear, one after another. It is sought for, and studied, and quoted from by all denominations. Communication with the productions of German authors and theologians, must serve more and more to remove the prejudice that used to exist on this subject, but which is now rapidly passing away. It seems, after all, that these Germans, whose writings have so much "the aspect of philosophical disquisitions," take the lead also in expounding the Word of God. May their labors meet with a rich reward!

Lectures on the Science of Religion; with a paper on Buddhist Nihilism, and a translation of the Dhammapada or "Path of Virtue." By Max Müller, M. A., Fellow of All-Saints' College, Oxford, &c., &c. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1872.

Those who have read Max Müller's three preceding volumes of "Chips from a German Workshop," will want this fourth volume,

and those who have read none of his works, may find this volume in itself full of freshness and vigor. Müller has become greatly interested in the science of religion, as embracing a comparative view of the religions of the world. It is natural that he should have imbibed a special interest in this study from his long and diligent labors in bringing out the sacred writings of Buddhism. It is, unquestionably, a rich mine that he is struggling to open. What comparative philology has done, and is doing, to bring out the unity of the race, and the brotherhood of man, that, and more than that, will the science of religion accomplish. It is truly wonderful how the unity of the race, and its organic unfolding, are making themselves felt in our day. Everything is coming to be studied historically, and history itself is viewed as an organic development of the life of the race. Religion is the deepest element of our life. To study it is to study the deepest power of history. Max Müller thinks the time is come when effort should be made to seek out the science—or scientific unity of the world's religions. They will serve to reveal the deep longing of humanity for that absolute religion which we have in Christianity. We fear the author does not make a wide enough distinction between natural and revealed religion, between the natural religions of the world, and the only revealed religion,—but his lectures furnish much food for thought.

The lectures on Buddhist Nihilism, Buddha's Dhammapada, are interesting studies in the religion of a large portion of the human race. These ancient oriental religions are becoming invested with a new interest, in view of the new openings for intercourse with Japan and China which are afforded.

THE AGREEMENT OF SCIENCE AND REVELATION. By Rev. Joseph H. Wythe, M. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Trubner & Co., London. 1872.

A very readable little book of nearly 300 pages, including Glossary and Index, neither of which we think are needed. The Glossary is interesting in itself, but not necessary to the understanding of the book. It is presumed that the reader will know what such words as "abnormal," "Archæology," "Chrysalis," &c., mean, and if they do not, an ordinary Dictionary would help them out of their trouble. This book cannot be said to master anything of the great problem with which it deals. The ground travelled over is quite too extensive to do anything more than to present a list of the various opinions held by scholars on the topics referred to. The chapters are 1. Relation of Science and Faith; 2. The Variations of Skepticism; 3. The Record of Faith; 4. The Interpretation of the Record; 5. The Revelation of God; 6. The Creation; 7. The Spiritual Nature of the Soul; 8. The Doctrine of a Mediator; 9. The Faith-Faculty in Man; 10. The Resurrection.

The writer shows considerable acquaintance with books. He travels over an extensive field, and his general position that there is, and can be, no real contradiction between science and revelation will be generally accepted. But he contributes little or nothing towards a reconciliation on points in reference to which they seem to stand in antagonism. His chapter on the "Variations of Skepticism" shows a rather superficial acquaintance with the movements of philosophy. English Deism, French Infidelity, and German Rationalism, are outlined by an enumeration of names, but scarcely anything more. The book is respectable in style, and handsomely published. Its perusal will serve at least to show the broad field on which the controversies of the present day are going forward.

Women In The Bible: Being a Collection of all the Passages of the Scripture, which relate to Women; with Brief Notes, Explanatory and Suggestive. By Aaron Williams, D. D. Genesis—Song of Solomon. Philadelphia: Alfred Martien, 1214 Chestnut Street, 1872. Pp. 315.

At the first perusal of the title of the above work, the casual reader of the Bible may wonder how it is possible to produce a book of interest on such a subject. His wonder, however, will be relieved, when he comes to look into the work itself. Even the most careful reader of the Scriptures will be surprised to find, how large a portion of them is taken up, in recording matters relating specially to women. The present volume does not extend further than the Song of Solomon, so that there is room for a similar volume of the same dimensions, devoted to the remaining portion of the Scriptures.

The design of this volume, as announced in the preface, is, to rescue from comparative neglect many passages of Scripture, especially in the Old Testament, which are either seldom read, or, if read, not fully understood or appreciated; to relieve the apparent indelicacy of certain passages, by proper explanations; to direct attention to many other portions of Scripture, not quoted in the work, but continuously referred to, so as to make the Bible, as far as possible, its own interpreter; to render the sacred volume generally, a much more interesting book to women than, perhaps, it now is; and by some hints, to promote the spiritual edification of women, and through them, to benefit, also, those of the other sex whom their influence can so powerfully reach. This design, the author has admirably executed. His criticisms are just and happy, and his practical suggestions appropriate and judicious. The work evidently embodies the results of much study and careful investigation. It is believed it will receive the favorable attention of those, for whose benefit especially, it has been prepared, and be the means of effecting much good. F.

WILFRID CUMBERMEDE. *By George Macdonald, author of "Alec Forbes," "Annals of a Quiet Neighborhood," "Robert Falconer," etc. Scribner, Armstrong & Co.* 654 *Broadway, New York.* 1872.

Mr. Macdonald has taken his place among the first fiction-writers of the age, and in this last work from his pen he has fully sustained his reputation. There is a simplicity and naturalness in his style and in the story, which contrasts pleasantly with the high-wrought and overstrained style and plot of the last age of fiction-writers. Even the disappointment which the reader feels in the *denouement* reveals the fact that he most truly represents nature, and does not seek to manufacture a conclusion in which all difficulties are resolved. There are some phases of religious views and feelings, which, so far as they represent the theory of the author, we could not endorse, but it is not the object of an artist to make theories but to represent them.

THE MEMOIR OF ROBERT CHAMBERS, *with autobiographic Reminiscences of William Chambers.* 1 *Vol.* 12*mo.* $1.50. *Scribner, Armstrong & Co.* 654 *Broadway, New York.* 1872.

This is the story of the lives of the editors and proprietors of the celebrated "Chambers' Journal." The work is written in classic style, highly instructive and entertaining, and eminently suited for all, but especially to be put into the hands of young men.

The reader is taken over the course of life, step by step, by which these brothers succeeded in building up one of the largest and most flourishing printing and publishing houses in Scotland. It is a narrative of steady, persevering, struggle and trial, which at length was crowned with success. There is something beautiful in the death scene of Robert Chambers, who died in the peaceful triumph of the Christian faith. By a singular providence his brother David, a younger brother, lying sick at the same time, upon hearing the intelligence of his brother's death immediately sank, and so followed him into the other world. As a combination of Autobiography and memoir this is one of the best books of the kind we have ever read. If any one desires to get hold of fine reading we would advise him to get this book,

THE HISTORY OF GREECE. BY PROFESSOR DR. ERNST CURTIUS. Translated by Adolphus William Ward, M. A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge; Professor of History in Owen's College, Manchester. Revised, after the last German Edition, with an Index, by W. A. Packard, Ph. D., Professor of Latin in the College of New Jersey. Vol. III. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1872.

Art. I.—HIS EXCELLENCY AND HIS ACCIDENCY.

BY C. Z. W.

Every man is a Genius.—So the Ancients thought and taught—Greek and Roman; Jew and Barbarian. The etymology of his generic name, MAN, in all cardinal languages like the vision which Saint Peter saw at Joppa, seems to declare: "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common!" However visible, therefore, the tower of Babel, may stand in the linguistic Heavens, there is no confusion of tongues here—no dispersion of mankind in this regard. Man is man

"For all that and all that"

from the Orient to the Occident. Deny it, and how shall we interpret the faith of ages in the fabled Genii? those fairy spirits, which were supposed to stand as sponsors over every mortal, to guide and govern his birth, life and history. Be they Tutelary Deities, Guardian Angels or Patron Saints, the Creed is all one in the root. What means this hoary theory, but to personify the peculiar structure of mind, which every man receives from his Maker? Does not this conception lie already in the primitive, as well as in its derivative term—*genius?*

Every man is born a genius.—This we may concede without

constituting him a prodigy. Why else are those ornate Legends, which ever adorn the lives of great men, made to reach back to their infancy, and issue from out of their cradles? A honey-bee softly kisses the lips of a sleeping child, and therefore, he becomes a mellifluous orator or a sweet singer. Napoleon already built snow-forts, when yet a lad, and played the Commanding General over his fellow-urchins. Martha Washington says: "George was always a good *boy*." John the Baptist had been consecrated *before* his birth. Angels and Prophets harbingered, for centuries ahead, the mission of the Saviour of mankind, and Simeon stands ready to interpret His character on the eighth day of His life. Nor do we find Him waiting for another call, but engaged in His Father's business, at twelve years—long ere the *insignia* of office were extended Him in Jordan. Read the history of any developed mortal backward, and under a microscope, and you may trace the foot-prints of his Guardian Angel, all along the line of life, clear up to his initiation into being. There are grounds for believing that a vague call has been heard in the still moments of every youth's eager onward course, who possessed himself of sufficient energy and ingenuity, to lead other minds, in manhood's period. Man is born with a mind peculiar to himself—*sui generis;* and for a purpose particular in itself. God never calls a mortal into being, but for a purpose. A niche for him to fill, stands open; a work for him to do, is waiting; a post for him to guard, is planted. His birth is his call. His genius is his commission. His work is his sphere—even though it be a hemisphere.

Every man is born an idiotic Genius.—We intend no paradox. We mean no paralysis of mental powers, by the term, *Idiotic*. Nor do we intend a recluse from society and the world, a sense in which it was once employed. We do mean, however, an untaught, uneducated and undeveloped genius. We still believe in a full-born Minerva, and from the mind of one greater than Jupiter too; but not in a Minerva fully-panoplied. There is Theology in Mythology, were there but wisdom enough among the Moderns to interpret the sense

of the Ancients. An egg is full and complete—finished. Still, the bird is not at hand and winged. I may hold in the hollow of my hand an acorn. It is the entire Oak condensed. Yet the tree is wanting. Thus it is too, that

"The child is father of the man,"

child though it be. But such a fatherhood the child can only realize by developing itself as a man. And here now we leave room for the application of that gray apothegm: "Every man the architect of his own fortune," which we prefer to render, every man the architect of his own genius. Homer was profoundly orthodox in styling men "companions of the Gods." In more than one sense must mortals work out their destinies, whilst God worketh in them. Every man thus becomes an associate principal, not a mere yoke-fellow; but an intelligent co-worker with his Maker, taking up the marble mass, buried in the mental quarry, shaping and polishing it into something like a God-man. And such man must be, if he would enjoy the society of His Maker,

In the glory of the Sunset—
In the islands of the Blessed—
In the land of the Hereafter.

Nature, when done with her task, enters upon her Sabbath. This is the programme, ever yet, after the creation of every human "Kosmos"—as truly as it was, when the morning stars sang their primeval melody, and God "rested on the seventh day from all His work, which He had made." But in the wake of the Maker's Sabbath, follows the working week for man. Nature waits on art, to appropriate and husband the proffered material. And if practice implies theory, no less does art presuppose science. What then is the first science for man to master?

"The proper study of mankind is man."

And the opening chapter in this volume wears this terse caption, "Know Thyself." This again falls into two sections. "Know thy Genius" is the first lesson; "Know thy Destiny" is the second lesson. To know his genius, is to grasp the Ariadnean thread from the hand of fortune; to penetrate

the labyrinth of life; to overcome and slay the mighty Minotaur of obstacles and to emerge into freedom, and a new existence. It is to discover, and to attain his destiny, as well. That man we choose to style, HIS EXCELLENCY. To remain untaught in reference to his genius, is, at the same time, to remain unequal to destiny. By consequence, he who knows not whence he is, cannot tell whither he is going. He penetrates the mazy labyrinth, without any knowledge of its various avenues and their windings; unaware of its countless inlets and outlets. He holds not in his hand the mystic thread. He is ever going, but never arriving. He is in advent, but comes not to any epiphany. He is a cosmopolitan; but no citizen. He is an Ishmael, a Bedouin, a wandering Jew, a lost man. This man we choose to style, HIS ACCIDENCY.

That it is possible for man's genius to run into herbs or into weeds, who will gainsay? Not Plutarch alone can discern the inequality among men. He tells us, that he does not find so great a difference between beast and beast, as is apparent between one man and another. He looks at man, however, as the tourist is permitted to survey the statue of Apollo Belvidere, without any wrappings around him. He brings the internal and native powers of his soul under a strong *focus*. Like Saint Chrysostom, he looks into the heart-chamber of man, to view his shekinah. Like the Grecian sculptors, he would see the subject exposed; not under accidental raiment and outward appendages, but simply *man*, nothing more. Under such close scrutiny Terrence, too, wildly exclaims:

> "How much, alas!
> One man another does surpass!"

But by what *gamut* shall we sing this man's *Gloria in Excelsis*, and that man's *De Profundis?* The tailor measures everybody by the same rule. By what standard, then, shall we estimate man, "HIS EXCELLENCY" or "HIS ACCIDENCY?"

Montaigne lays down this rubric: "*A man to be valued for what he has in him, and not by what he has about him.*" His illustrations are as quaint as they are striking. A horse is commended for his strength, swiftness and sureness of foot

—not for his saddle, bridle and rich caparisons. A greyhound is costly because of his tact and speed—not for his golden collar. A hawk is prized for her wing—not for her jesses and bells. It is the blade that makes the sword—not the scabbard. Thus man is man, by what is of him—not by what is around him. His train; his palace; his credit; his many thousands a year; his station and office; his coat and over-coat—these are all externals. Whatever is not inherent in man, is necessarily an accidental appendage. And under this view, most men are only dove-tailed accidents. To arrive at their proper estimate, you dare as little include their excrescences, as we may form our conception of man's ordinary size, from a dropsical invalid, dilated into unnatural dimensions. Take him from his pedestal, which grew not under him. Take him from his stilts, which must not be reckoned into his stature. Take away his revenues, and titles; his pedigree and his wife's money—stand him out a *sansculottist!* Then approach his interior and say: "Of what make is his soul? Is that strong, capacious and beautiful? Is it rich in what is all its own, and not in what is foreign and borrowed? Is that soul conscious of itself? Deliberate in its aim? Consistent with itself? Is its birth a prophecy of its history, and its history again an approximation towards its destiny?" If so, then the man is genuine. In spite of temporary perversions and faults, he is still every inch a man. A fly may light in the apothecary's ointment. He does not cast the ointment away, but takes the fly out. The rivulet may muddy its waters, not from its impure fountain always, but from rubbage falling in by the way. So likewise may a just man fall seven times, and yet not spoil himself out and out. To find the man, then, we must inquire *within*. Outside, you meet his accidentals only—his regimentals, rather, under which many craven spirits cower and hide themselves, and pass as brave soldiers, both in and out of the army, nevertheless.

Tersely and happily, are our individual wrappings and surroundings styled "*Circumstances*"—things standing around

us. The German calls them "*Umständen*," with like transparent emphasis. But what a train of various and opposite proverbs follow in the wake of that term "Circumstances!" One tells me: "Circumstances make the man!" "Man is a creature of circumstances!" "It is all owing to circumstances!" Another tells me: "Man makes circumstances!" "Man must control circumstances!" "Circumstances only serve as occasions!" Here are antipodes. And as we seize the dilemma by one horn or the other, will we have "His Excellency" or "His Accidency." Let us see. The masses cry: "Circumstances make the man!" That is the voice of majorities—and majorities mean Democracy. The Sages teach: "Man makes circumstances!" That is the language of minorities—and minorities mean aristocracy. Have we then democracy against aristocracy? So it seems. Must not then the few submit to the many? Perhaps. There is much orthodoxy in the adage, "*Vox populi, vox Dei.*" Still, proverbs delight in ultraism, and cannot be accepted without conditions attached. God must dwell with men, ere men can talk the language of God. Angels must descend before they may ascend. God is Truth; and only when truth becomes incarnate, may the masses echo the mind of God; else the crowd would not have preferred Barabbas to Jesus Christ. And then, again, the voice of prophets—though isolated and few—is the voice of God, as well. Still, they may err too and report falsely. Truth is not limited to number, be the number large or small. A Saul may enter the ranks of the prophets. Hence the voice of majorities is not infallible—though that be a ruling democracy. Nor is the voice of minorities unmistakable—though that be a choice aristocracy. Hence we are forced to strike an average and listen to the utterance of Truth, which is *theocracy*.

It cannot be denied, that circumstances conduce much towards making and unmaking men—as the phrase goes. The rebellion, for example, has quickened a host of soldiers and heroes, statesmen and patriots; philanthropists, and presidential candidates into life. So has it, on the other hand, quenched the lights of

many—forever!—buried them—not under the clods simply—that were a blessing; but in graves of oblivion, from which there is no resurrection. Thus opportunity, favor and fortune stand as kind God-fathers to thousands; while enticements and temptations seem to prove a slaying Nemesis to an equal and still greater number.

But, let us now ask—Who will maintain, that circumstances have ever originated, or created and settled a man, where there had been no man before—like May-showers, are said to start mushrooms forth? Where the material had not been in existence and in manly condition already? Where a manful character had not been in waiting previously—the *stamina*, from which alone the idea of man is capable of production? Did the grandest series of circumstances ever originate a single man? Surely circumstances can have no *creative* energy. The sea does not breed ships—it only bears or sinks them. In what relation then, do man and his circumstances stand to each other? How do they severally affect one another—act and react?

Let us this mystery explore. If circumstances be man's surroundings; then the nearest surroundings are his clothes. They are our most familiar accidents. They belong to man. He cannot well do without them. To many men and women they are not only the nearest, but also the *dearest* surroundings—essentials—the *summum bonum* of beauty and of worth. Take them away, and you have left, not stuff enough to cast the shadow of a man—or woman. Like a snow-figure, they cannot bear exposure. Yet, clothes are only *for* man, and not of him. "Nine tailors cannot make a man." God said: "Let us make man." And *He* made him. So does He ever yet, without the aid of Wanamaker & Brown, Bennet & Company, Stokes—or any other clothier! As long, accordingly, as the primitive pair felt themselves to be independent of the clothes-circumstances, they were nearer human and more divine, than they became when covered under such surroundings. They had been above those outside accidentals and enveloping regimentals—above circumstances. Subsequently they

were raggedly circumstanced which means, surrounded and taken.

And to-day, even, in proportion, as the race is struck harder and still harder with a *clothes-mania*, in that proportion have we less men and women, and more ladies and gentlemen—fops and fairies! But clothes are to man, what the inner bark is to a tree—the nearest outside layer. Around that is another layer; and another; and another. So is the individual enveloped by a series of circumstances, of surroundings; sometimes countless in number and wide in extent—as a pebble in the lake will encircle itself with ever new and ever widening rings. Now, however necessary, efficient and comfortable all such accidents may prove; or, however cumbersome, dangerous and fatal they may be, they are still outside and independent of him. They are in no sense a part of man. Lying close and hard against him, and seemingly one with him, they are nevertheless externals. Rob him of all, and the man is still there, as largely and as truly, as was Adam, when he stood before his Maker in the garden, freshly risen from his mould of clay—without a shred around him. Who will say, that the fig-leaves contributed anything *additional* to the finished handiwork of God? They were only an outside layer—an accident—a circumstance to the being previously made and made entire. But what else are all the manifold surroundings, commonly called circumstances, in which you find men enveloped, in the world at large, but so many garments of fustian—of linsey-woolsey or of shoddy, on the one side; and of silk—of velvet, or of cloth, on the other?

Carlyle has a chapter in his "Sartor Resartus," entitled; "The World in Clothes," and another: "The World out of Clothes"—both of which learned theses we take severally to mean, that this man, surrounded with favorable circumstances—in fine clothes—is handsome *therefore*—"His Accidency;" and that man, without any such layers of happy surroundings, and handsome, *nevertheless*—"His Excellency." In the former case, "clothes make the man"—such a man as he is though! In the latter case, the man had been made, before his garments were drawn around him—and he is the better

man by far. So circumstances make some men, as ready-made clothing can dress out the beggar of to-day in full costume; whilst other men make circumstances to their ministering angels, as they have their garments measured and fitted to taste. And only when the coat becomes the man, and the man his coat, can we have *style*:—which, being interpreted, means—the man for the circumstances, and the circumstances for the man. Or, again—the man for the times, and the times for the man. Or, still again—the right man in the right place.

As a matter of fact, no man is absolutely above and independent of his surroundings. No man can be thus self-existent. He is born into a world full of surroundings and layers, which at once engulf him. Without any election of his own, or consultation on his part, he is thus circumstanced and taken captive. Can we then still speak of man as master over circumstances? Verily we can. An individual, plunged into the sea, is immediately enveloped in sheets of water. After the cry has gone up—"A man overboard!" the first question is—"Can he swim?" "Has he a life-preserver about him?" If "Yes," then we feel morally certain, that he will come up and stay aloft, on the top of waves and foam—above circumstances. But if "No," then we expect him to flounder and sink—to perish under the force of circumstances. The former is "His Excellency." The latter—"His Accidency."

In like manner may we say, the moment a child is born into this world—into this sea of circumstances: "A man overboard!" And if God has placed an air-chamber in the body of every little fish—as Naturalists tell us—by which it may rise to the surface, at will, from the mud and dregs of the under-stream, then He has surely not forgotten to endow man—"created in His own image and likeness"—with a like buoyant element—an elevating apparatus—a Life-Preserver; by which he may rise upward, from birth on already, in proportion as he becomes skillful in the using of it; by which he may ascend above all his surroundings—surmount circumstances. Yea those very surroundings may serve as foot-holds for him to mount still higher, as the waves of the sea bear

ships and bathers up. With such a life-buoy equipped, circumstances bear that man aloft. They do not *make* him, in any sense, however. He is made, and well made, else such terrific surroundings would unmake him—dissolve and waste him away—as an unseaworthy craft is dismembered by the angry waters, which they still bore no part in making. The sea only swallows wrecked vessels—not the sound bark. Crows do not devour the living lion—only his carcass. Neither do circumstances bury live men; they only bury the dead, which is no misfortune. Neither have ten thousand hurricanes ever made a single oak. But by exercising its innate elasticity, when yet a "Babe in the Woods;" by properly applying its natural endowment, it has taken advantage even of fierce blasts and howling tempests; rooted itself still deeper; grown still higher; formed its ribs still stronger and widened its area—all the more a king of oaks, because storm-nursed and storm-grown. Every forest-giant became such by virtue of two factors in its history; it was first, circumstanced, and, secondly it triumphed over circumstances. Thus every well-made man, by virtue of this circumstance-governing energy, or life-buoy, may likewise mount aloft and make his very surroundings chariots and velocipedes.

But is this man's Life-Buoy damaged—as boys sometimes jag the air-chamber in the fish, by piercing it with a pin—then he sinks to the bottom and stays ever under. It is by *remaining* under, that men drown—not by descending only. He succumbs to circumstances, as the damaged oak bows and falls before the tempest. Ships are first wrecked and then only sunk. So men are first injured, and consequently ruined. Their surroundings proved but occasions to hasten on the calamity, and were in no sense the primary cause. The difference between "His Excellency" and "His Accidency" is, not that the one is furnished with a Life-Preserver, and the other not. Both had that in the outstart. "God is no respecter of persons." But herein is the difference: "His Excellency" has preserved it, and has skillfully exercised it in season. Hence it serves him good purposes. It is to him as the rudder in the hand of the helms-

man, which governs the ocean-steamer. Fling him into the Nile, and he will come up with a fish in his mouth, or a pearl in his hand. His Accidency has damaged his Life-buoy. "How?" do you ask! Ah! How many ways are there to Jeddo? Indolence has corroded it. Dissipation has enervated it. Intemperance has maimed it; whisky and tobacco have enfeebled it; ambition has over-strained it; violence has ruptured it. He has rendered it worthless somehow. It helps him no longer. It clogs him rather. He must go under—and stay there.

Such an unfortunate is ready to exclaim: "I am the victim of circumstances!" "Circumstances have overmastered and crushed me!" But did he not lie down first, else how could his surroundings have gotten above him? A man must surely fall under the car, ere the car can overrun and crush him. As long as circumstances remain *mere* circumstances—that is: surroundings; so long the man is in no danger. But when they once become *upper-stances* and man the *under-stance*—then he is submerged and gone—so long as he remains underneath. Should that be too long—the man drowns. In this way the deluge of circumstances has already swept away more victims than the Flood in Noah's time. The cases of "Accidental drownings" are far more numerous than those cited in the Reporter's column.

This is the conclusion then—God has created every full man with plenary power to live in the midst and yet above circumstances—just as the ship rides amid and still over the waves. In so far too, is man master over his surroundings, as not to be manacled and fettered by them in any slavish sense. To deny this; to say that man is the victim of circumstances—for good or for evil—is to narrow down and ignore his moral freedom. You might as well maintain, that his clothes are grown fast to his person, as the hide to the animal or the shell to the land-turtle, or terrapin; that he cannot *doff* and *don* them. Man's freedom lies in the power of doing what is best for him. He alone is free, who has both himself and his surroundings in his own power, in such a way as to be held under by no element or

force outside of himself. Truth dwells inside of man, and "whom the Truth makes free, he is free indeed." It is grandeur itself, to be thus free—liberated from that entire domain of tyranny, which the Emancipation Proclamation did not wholly cover; to have power to tread on scorpions and serpents, and not suffer them to entwine themselves around us.

All antiquity is echoing its praises over Socrates and his bowl of hemlock. "A brave mind, struggling against adversity," says Seneca, "is an attractive spectacle to the gods." The Christian world has no greater hero to boast over, than St. Paul, who had not only been a free-born Roman citizen, but had likewise elevated himself so far above his surroundings, as to be able to be the same Paul, whether high or low; whether hungry or filled; whether in abundance or in want—in whatsoever state, he was, therewith to be content—himself—free. Hear ye the declaration of this master over his surroundings: "We are troubled on every side; yet not distressed. We are perplexed; but not in despair. Persecuted; but not forsaken. Cast down; but not destroyed." Evidently Paul knew nothing of being "crushed by one's surroundings" or concerning the "victim of circumstances." Pitiable man is he, aside of Paul, who moves in the empire of boundless freedom with the soul of a slave!

Now this power is furnished every man by his Creator, in an embryo state. With blood in his veins; with strength in his limbs; with vision in his eyes; with all the normal forces of his physical and moral nature, comes also this *circumstance-governing energy*. It lies dormant in all men, in their opening history. Like magnetism in iron, it sleeps until it is awakened and called into activity by exercise. In some men it is never brought into use. They remain the sport and foot-ball of their surroundings—mere *Accidencies*. Others awaken it early and employ it energetically, and thereby become *Excellencies*. The oars to the boat may be at hand; but lying idle, they serve no purpose. The boatman must ply them.

Whatever the allotments of fortune may be then; of whatever nature our surroundings may prove; whatever favorable

complexion our circumstances may assume—they are all adversaries to us in the end—"smiling Greeks bearing presents" —unless there be at hand a real and true man to interpret and govern them—a Prophet to discern—a Priest to sacrifice, and a King to reign over them. There must be an understanding to recognize; a will to control and a heart to relish them. Their enjoyment, not their presence alone, can render our circumstances a scaffolding to the character in process of building. A fool, a drone or a sot, neither sees, relishes nor appropriates the material at hand.

> "Himself—not fortune—every man must blame,
> Since men's own manners as their fortunes frame."

Providence pours a cornucopia, of less or greater compass over every man's head. The material for the erection of his tabernacle is afforded him even in the wilderness. The implements and tools are all at his command. Then is heard the exhortation—"Render yourself His Excellency, or, His Accidency—as you will!" Such is man's election, over which he may both rejoice and tremble.

Thus far we have dealt with an abstraction. Let us now come to the matter of experience and common life. In the issue then, and as a consummated fact, when is this man His Excellency, or that man, His Accidency? An English statesman once answered the question—"*What is Dirt?*" in these words:—"*Dirt is a substance out of place.*" Irrelevant as it may strike us in its first falling, it will prove itself an apt reply on reflection. Let us analyze it: Hay, straw and stubble are only then dirt, when scattered about the lawn and garden-walks—when out of place. Earth, wood and offal become dirt only when they litter the carpet and floor, as the house-wife declares—when out of place. Having a place for everything, and everything in its place, you may boldly challenge the world to show you any Dirt. God never made the article—man makes dirt.

Now we are ready to inquire—Who is His Excellency or His Accidency—in fact? The outside crowd, always noisy and rash, spoils for an answer. Let us hear it. "Man is His Ex-

cellency or His Accidency, as he sinks or swims in the popular Sea." So readeth the first verse in the first Chapter of the Gospel, as written by the rabble. But foam, and spray and drift-wood float and climb aloft; whilst the precious metals sink to the bottom. Cork and feathers swim in air and water; that will not gold, and silver, and the diamond. The boy's kite sails to a dizzy height; but is for all that, not quite as important as is the Pacific Railroad, lying under, over Prairie-ground. To sink or swim then, is not to survive or perish, whether proclaimed in the Continental Congress, or declaimed in the village school-house. A man in the steeple is not, on that account, the biggest man of all. A publican, acting on that theory, once climbed a sycamore tree, in order the better to reach Truth incarnate. But it was told him peremptorily —"Zaccheus! Come down!" And by descending, his mind dilated, his soul swelled, and he ascended to Heaven a great soul. Ah! Pearls and precious stones are only found far below. Angels descend, we say again, ere they ascend. So must man sink ere he can rise. He must go down, in order to come up and stay up. It is one of those truthful paradoxes, that he must become a little child, ere he can grow gigantic. This is God's Gospel, which is ever true. The popular sea is too unstable an element, for any cargo of excellency to trust itself on. There you may see the adventurer—the ass in masquerade; the little man incrusted in office and pompous paraphernalia — His Accidency. But His Excellency is shy of the fatal pool. It is too much of a whirlpool for him. He trusts not its dangerous waters. And if washed into it for a time, he steers for a safe port rapidly. Man is not His Excellency or His Accidency then, as he sinks or swims in the popular sea. There Prophets, Apostles and Heroes may change to martyrs; whilst fop-doodles and fools may ride at a John Gilpin's rate. The crowd is wrong.

Who then is His Excellency or His Accidency in truth? The crowd grows clamorous again and is eager to answer once more. Give it another hearing: "Man is His Excellency or His Accidency, as he is successful or unsuccessful." So

readeth the Gospel of the rabble, in the second Chapter. Let it be tested. By successful men, is meant, those who are permitted to eat the fruit of their own sowing, by the next approaching autumn; those who may gather their own planting by the first coming harvest season; those who realize an early interest on their investments; those who live to see the monuments which their fellows erect to their glory. Men who hear the Hosanna shout, and die before the "crucify" cry comes. But Fitch and Fulton, died paupers. Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. John the Baptist was beheaded in the Bastile of Machœrus, to please the dancing daughter of an adulterous mother. Paul was slain. John the divine withered away. And (let us bow our heads reverently!) Christ died on the Cross, in the infancy of His mission. All these died, not having tasted the first fruits of their husbandry. But surely they were all Excellencies. Unsuccessful, in the plebeian sense, but still Excellency personified. Ah! in no book, which God or Truth has ever written, can we read, that popular success is any sign of greatness of soul, or, that temporary failure is a proof of littleness. Yea, 'a corn of wheat must die, or it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.' The crowd has erred again. The regular way is to hang, kill, crucify the heroes, and trample them under stupid hoofs for a century or two. Then we bray over their tombs until we resurrect them.

Now we will venture an answer—*His Excellency is he who attains the Destiny which his genius indicates. And he who fails to land in his destined harbor, is His Accidency.* There is a polarity of mind as well as of the magnet. When the compass-needle deviates from its certain point, we have a "*variation.*" As man maintains his polarity and varies not, he is His Excellency. Let him deviate, and he degenerates into His Accidency. So long as an engine moves forward on the course laid for it, we have progress, and an approximation towards its goal. Only as it collides, forsakes its track, to the right or left of it; or, halts in its course, have we an accident. Man is an engine, strong, beautiful and grand. He is an excelsior engine. His mind is his motive-power; his genius is

his path-way; his Destiny is his goal. The moment you disturb this admirable arrangement, you destroy his polarity, his centrality and circumferentiality. And to destroy that is to wreck the whole man. Every man is a separate engine, moving on its own road and towards its own port. There is no "*Union Railroad*" for minds, however *Pacific*. No two are alike or one with each other. It is sometimes said, "No man can be an original!" but surely every man *is* an original in his look and walk; in his laugh and talk. And why not, then, in every other respect, as well? Show us two bodies alike, and we will admit, that God has made two minds over the same die, alike and accidental to each other. But not *twin-born* children even, are alike, however similar. Yea the Siamese-twins disprove the homogeneity of mankind. Individuals are not distinguished from each other only externally; the inward man is peculiar likewise. Every man's identity lies in his personality, in that which separates him from all others; and not in his familiarity with his neighbor and fellow. Hence impartial history, when speaking of the specific man, cancels and ignores all common factors, held by the generic man. A Biography, for example, to be of any account, dare not pick the stones lying along the common highway of humanity and build them into a character. That is giving us a *made-man;* and not a man born. It answers its end as little as the school-boy's snow-man. A genuine history of an individual man, may only note such qualities which distinguish him from the masses, from the thousand millions of men around him. All common properties must slough off. The written life of every individual must be an *autography*, or it is not worth writing or reading. Accordingly as every man magnifies his own personality; as he rounds off and expands his *peculiar* nature, does he become excellent. His own sublimated identity constitutes his grandeur, as a rock is grand, standing solitary by the sea; no grander in its altitude, however, than in its solitude. It was once believed by us, that man becomes somebody great, in proportion as he can imitate and render himself like unto Newton, Jonathan Edwards, William Penn, or

some other corypheus. Single out some great character, some marked man, who stands out in bold relief, it was told us; try and be like him, and that will make you great likewise. There is some truth in the theory. That *is* the way to become a great—monkey! But we see now, that, in order to make yourself truly small, in the eyes of all who read the papers, it is only necessary to select a great character, climb up and cling fast to him, as the vine to the trellis. That is very littleness. Why does a creeper cling to its foreign support? Because it has no spinal strength of its own. What names have we for men, who get down and prepare to be swallowed up by others? Who crave to be like everybody whom they fancy; who are nothing to any one, because they would be everybody, save themselves? Who ignore themselves and assume such complexions as those may be of, whom they meet with? Are they not ciphers? Sycophants? Accidents? The crowd calls them "Toadies," "Spoonies." A man is not an alligator, even though one should condescend to gulp you. Jonah was still Jonah though sheltered in a big fish for three whole days, and graduated. If man is a mere Accidency whenever, and in the measure as he wishes and aspires after being like unto others, and unlike himself, then it follows, that he is only Excellency, as he is himself, however unlike others, he may be. That is what we understand by an "independent man," in the true sense. That is manliness, to the full.

Do you understand, now, when we declare every man to be His Excellency, in proportion as he aspires after and attains the destiny which his own and peculiar genius indicates? This is only to declare every man His Excellency as he is and preserves himself. A duplicate of Excellency spoils the original. No two men were ever alike; and surely two excellencies must then be unlike each other. If it were possible, thus, for men to imitate one another, there would soon be an end to greatness. All would then enter the race after some prominent character, and become alike great. But were all to become alike great, then greatness itself would become common and little. Two Washingtons would spoil the original George

forever in American history, and afford us but two half Washingtons. Two Jeffersons, two Jacksons, two Clays, would reduce the several originals, in grandeur and greatness, by one-half exactly. And as we multiply them in number, we cheapen them in quality, as plenty always destroys rarity and high prices.

It is a reproach against the whole Chinese Empire, that all its women can wear one shoe. The mothers of the young Celestials clamp their infant feet. (In America that torturing is done in later life). But what is Chinese or American foot-clamping aside of the fettering and clamping of mind into a certain uniform shape? Stocks for the feet are not near so ruinous as are those mental fetters, which are forged by the great public, into which it is designed to fasten all minds, in order to give them a uniform shape. Deformed feet are unnatural; but crippled and dwarfed minds are monstrous. We can see why wrong-minded men should be put in "strait-jackets" to keep them within the limits of their proper manhood; but we cannot see why right-minded men should be made to wear them for the purpose of distracting them, and rendering them "beside themselves," that they may not be themselves, but some person foreign to themselves.

Public opinion becomes a tyranny here, and merits a rebuke. Nor is the institution to be commended that would, first of all, melt its students into a liquid mass, in order to bring them forth like so many *fac-similes* of each other—like "ten little Injuns standing in a line!"

A certain founder in Florence fell into despair because he could not cast the statue of a horse and of an Arch-bishop in the same mould. Every similar educational effort will prove alike unsuccessful. In the Apostolic College every mental type was left intact, and developed itself as such. So must we distinguish between a university and a depot of monotony. By all means give us "the same spirit;" but let us not forget the "diversities of gifts." The *Esprit de corps* we advocate; but the utterance of "Shibboleth" or "Sibboleth" ought not to be made a rubric for any establishment if some other than mere routine men are wanted.

It is wonderful how certain models are set, from one age to another, after which it is designed to fashion mind. In our boyhood the Clay and Webster mania were epidemics. The press, the pedagogue, and the public were doing their utmost to persuade the school-boys that every one of us could be just like Clay or Webster. We obeyed them in so far as to con their orations. But it proved a mistake. Not one of us ever became the one or the other. Nor do we believe we ever will! Did the world ever hold more than one Daniel Webster, or more than one Sage of Ashland?

And so there came a Grant-fever, which was very contagious. It was taken for granted that every child, granted as a grant by the granting Creator, might become a President Grant if only the effort be made. Because there is a General Grant it was inferred that henceforth Grant could be rendered *general*, and need no longer be definite and particular. But there will never be a second Grant. We will never look upon his like again, nor upon the *fac-simile* of any other great or small man. There are great men in every age—some we see; others we do not see.

> "There are great men—I have known such—
> Whom their people understand not;
> Whom they even make a jest of;
> Scoff and jeer at in derision."

There are as great men now as ever have been. There will be such hereafter. God's font never runs dry. But they are all different from one another. And just in their variety and peculiarity lies the grandeur of every marked character. Their genius is peculiar; their characters unique; their destinies different. Dare to make them similar and alike, in any absolute sense, and you have a printer's *pi*.

Men vainly tried their utmost to make a second Washington out of General Grant. It can never be successfully done. Just as silly was it to persuade us that Andrew Jackson had returned in the person of Andrew Johnson. Andrew *is* Andrew in both instances. Jack's son is John's son. But Andrew Johnson is still not Andrew Jackson. Elijah and Elisha are not one and

the same—though the same mantel be worn by both. You may convert one machine into another, but never one man into another, without spoiling both. One Washington for all time; one Jackson; one Lincoln; one Newton; one *John* Brown (how many other Browns we know not!); one Schleiermacher;—but one single copy of every mental type. That is the law of mind. God's mint strikes a separate device for every soul. He never repeats Himself. The model is broken, the moment the man is born—and broken forever! As manifold as are the works of God in nature, so that they never exactly repeat themselves, so manifold are His pictures of mind. In one sense, every man is a Melchisedeck—without any relations or consanguinity. Even Elijah and Elisha are only to each other as parallel lines. Every mind is just as much a separate and peculiar world, as every star is. It is not a correct proposition, to say that history repeats itself, absolutely. Neither universal, national nor individual history repeats itself. Nature abhors a tread-mill.

"No originals born!" Why—there are none other born! It required two hundred years to teach the Americans that negroes were not apes, baboons, chimpanzees, ourang-outangs or gorillas. But it seems we need another Theseus to exploed the theory, that all white men are mere imitators—white monkeys!

That old monster—Procrustes—laid every man he met—dwarf and giant—on his fatal couch, stretching the former and whittling down the latter, until both fitted the bed. And what was the result? That he killed all. Very much the same is the notion, that all men must be fitted over the same last, in order to be excellent. All must be made over the Newton last, the Washington last, the Grant last—over any last, only not each one over his own. But now, an egg, though differing in size and quality from all other eggs, is equally finished and complete. So may men be equally excellent and great, though wholly dissimilar in characters, callings and achievements. They may be antipodes in every feature, and yet all excellent. Compare Crœsus and Lazarus; Philosopher and Pariah; king and vassal; hermit and financier; John the Baptist and Saint Paul. All these are excellent, but how different!

Accordingly, as every peculiar genius is interpreted and directed towards its allotted destiny, have we excellence. White, red or black man; Christian, Jew, Mohammedan or Pagan; divine, physician or jurist; merchant, artist or mechanic; orator, poet or singer; public man or private man—whoever, whatever, and wherever he be found, there do we take off our hat and greet him as "His Excellency!" And as man ignores himself; becomes a hanger-on to others; neglects his own genius whilst pursuing that of others; merges in the mass around him, as a drop commingles with the sea; denies his own manhood; belittles his own mind and sphere; in that measure he loses himself, destroys his personality, and becomes "His Accidency."

But, granting all this, "*Why, then, is excellency so rare a commodity?*" "I will answer, I will tell you."

No winds serve him who has no destined port. Demosthenes says, in his Funeral Oration on the soldiers slain at Cheronea, "The beginning of all virtue is consultation and deliberation; the end and perfection is consistency." That means, let every man know and study his genius, and then steer consistently for his allotted harbor. But this the few only do. Most men are mere "lumps"—unshaped and without form—chaos. Their histories are patch on patch, without regard to size, color, fitness, or character. Their lives are piles, not pillars; heaps are they, not columns; earth-works thrown up, not pyramids built. All their acts are arrows shot at random. No design is any where apparent. "No wonder," says Seneca, "that chance has so great a dominion over men, since most men live by chance," and die by chance, accidencies all through. Saint James speaks of such as "driven by the wind and tossed," as "double-minded," and "unstable in all their ways."

How shall we hope for consistency between genius and destiny here? Whence shall symmetry come? And if not this, how then excellency? It is impossible to fit separate pieces well, unless we have the entire plan preconceived and laid down. The joiner hews, notches, and bores amid lumber, chips and offal. You think he does it all at random. But the framework is in his mind, and at the "raising" all is fitly joined

together. So must every man be first an architect to draft and plan his history. That is the very spirit of the ancient adage: "*Every man the* ARCHITECT *of his own fortune.*"

Lorenzo Dow once said, "This day one year hence, God willing, I will preach on this spot." Sure enough, three hundred and sixty-five days, and six hours subsequently, he stood there and preached. Lorenzo was a great man, because he was himself. Had he not been that, he might have passed into oblivion, and become lost amid the vast army of accidencies. But the moment a man is himself, we hear the cry, "An eccentric!" "*Ein Sunderling!*" Begging your pardon, we maintain that he is just the opposite; he is *con*centric. He who forsakes his orbit, and departs from himself, intruding into the spheres of other men—he is the *ec*centric, let it be remembered. As long as any man is under the centripetal force of his own being and not torn away by the centrifugal power of any foreign person, he cannot be styled "eccentric." But were it even so, what then? We have seen that every man is peculiarly formed. Now, if he remains consistent with his genius, and pursues the groove marked out for him, is he not just what he is intended to be? Let him be regarded as eccentric or concentric, is not he consistent with his genius, and, in so far, on the road, the end of which is his destined port? Why laugh that man down? "Better laugh at yourself, I reckon," the Widow Bedott would say, for not being equally independent and free.

Every star has its own orbit; out of that it never moves. So has every man his own sphere, and as he forsakes *that*, his manhood and happiness is crossed. We verily believe, that not a few minds were on the way to excellence, in their native pathway, the end of which lay high, but a tyrannic custom, an enslaving public opinion sneered, laughed, or frightened them out of the allotted orbit into a foreign road. In this way the "*Vox Populi*" sometimes proves a wild beast to man. This or that man died in obscure accidency, since we would not suffer him to be himself.

Genius will not be subject to Procrustean laws without fatal results following. That was one reason why Fitch and Fulton

died for a season; but their circumstances being peculiar, they were resuscitated and lived withal. There had been a conspiracy to kill off Professor Morse and his telegraph in Congress. But happily they were foiled in their plot, and fell into the grave dug for their intended victim. So may all conspirators perish.

Those common but sacred terms, "Saint," "Saintly," and "Saintship;" what meaning cleaves to them, but separate, isolated, and foreign from the mass? The Saints are all peculiar and separate in life and history. Just so do we maintain, in a lower sense, must every man be a *separatist*, if he would be significant. There is a solitariness possible in a great city; a loneliness even in the crowd. Just so is there an individuality necessary in the bosom of universality, in order to excellency. Will he be ordinary, common, and apish—attain to accidency? Let him simply lose himself in the masses.

"But would you have every man to be a comet? Shall we all fly off in tangential lines? Is there so great a virtue in being erratic? No! We would not have *every* man to be a comet. That would be monotony again. And it is just against this tiresome sameness that we protest. It is always and everywhere irksome. Were all the heavenly bodies comets, the firmament would be spoiled. But if your Creator has created you a comet; given you a comet-mind; endowed you with the brilliancy of a comet; enabled you to sport the tail of a comet—then a comet you ought and must be, to be any thing significant. No authority, outside of yourself, is potent enough to render you a fixed star. Lorenzo Dow would have been a perfect nobody, had he not been just Lorenzo. So will you be lost in the nebulæ of humanity, unless you be just a comet. Only be sure, however, that the tail you sport, *be* a comet-tail, and not that of a peacock!

But God creates some men as suns, to shine upon Europe and America, and upon Asia and Africa, and the isles of the sea. They are lights of the world. Others are of the mellow moonlight order. He will have his mental stars of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth magnitude. Whatever I am created, that let me be, and be it heroically. If a glow-worm,

let me shimmer contentedly among the clods. If not, then will I go out in darkness. Let every man be himself, and he will be relatively His Excellency; let him be some one, or something else, and you have His Accidency. On the mountain or in the valley, show yourself and you reveal all the Excellency in you; whatever you borrow is Accident.

Thus Blind Tom, an idiotic negro lad, is great, because he is peculiar and unlike all others. Blondin is great on his wires and ropes. Tumble him off of those, and he meets with accidency and is hid in the jostling crowd. Morse is great on his telegraph. But his brother Sidney is just as great a religious chronicler. Cyrus W. Field is great, with his cable around him, like Laocoon, amid entwined serpents. Louis Agassiz is great, though reputed "a crazy Dutchman." Thaddeus Stevens is great. And so is Alexander H. Stephens—on the Confederacy! Longfellow is a great Fellow. Stewart, the merchant prince, is great—in or out of the Cabinet. Henry Harbaugh is a great Pennsylvania German. Knud Iverson, the martyr lad, who would not tell a lie! is great. Any man or woman, boy or girl, is great, that is not of the routine-make. Who will not, day in and day out, drive in the rut of the travelling masses, who is not a routinist.

What is the meaning of that term, *Accident?* Does it not signify a falling from one's orbit? Let the planet Venus intrude into Saturn's circle, and there will be an accident, in fact and effect. But is that less ruinous than that a mind like Augustine's should collide into the sphere of a Celsus? Or an Athanasius into the track of Arius? Rather a land-slide, by far, than a man-slide!

We speak of Julian, "the Apostate," as though that were a solitary instance. The world is full of *apostates*. Every man is Julianized—an apostate—as he fails to attain the destiny which his genius indicated. "As a bird that wandereth from her nest, so is a man that wandereth from his place," says the builder of the Temple.

How does a wrecked man differ from a wrecked engine? In so far as the former exceeds the value of the latter. A line of

engines stretched along the Union Pacific Railroad, one against the other—all these do not equal one immortal mind. Still, the newspaper reporters are careful to note the wrecking of every single one. God's record, however, will alone reveal the mental wrecks.

"But how shall I know my Genius and my Destiny?" If your inner light does not afford you the desired revelation, then your mental chamber must be very darkness. If, therefore, the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness! It is as easy to detect the inclination of your genius, as it is to realize the taste of your palate. Here we remind you again of Demosthenes' consultation and deliberation. But alas! In our onward rushing, careless, helter-skelter age, no one stops to consider what direction the finger-board of Genius indicates, and so drives on over the main, broad road that leads to Accidency—to destruction.

Finally, Excellency has its degrees; and so has Accidency. Greatness is not always goodness. Nor is littleness always iniquity. There are Great Demons and Little Saints as well as Great Saints and little devils—imps. When may we speak of His Excellency, then, as His Grand Excellency; or of His Accidency as His Grand Accidency? There are myriads of worlds floating in the heavenly heights, however unconscious we may be of their existence. Still, all are under the influence of the sun. He is monarch of the spheres. Every separate orbit, with its revolving world within, is held centripetally firm to its place. The rays of the centre sun, like so many check-reins, govern the flying spheres. Philosophers call this the centripetal force. Were it not for this energy, every planet would fly away, seething and dashing through the spaces. But this power from the sun is exerted with such constancy and propriety, that every sphere keeps its place. There are no dark stars. We never read of accidences in the heavens. But the spheres are not free. They are slaves to the wheel. No credit is due them for their order and obedience, because they have no election, no choice. They must be where and what they are. So there are a thousand millions of human worlds down in the earth. We mean the

minds of men, women and children. Every mortal has his orbit and native force assigned it. Every mental orbit is, furthermore, placed in a certain relation and at a certain distance from the great central sun of humanity—the Incarnate God. From that sun, likewise, emanates a centripetal force on all minds in the earth—on Pagans, Jews and Christians relatively. The drawing of the Father is exerted over all.

Now if all souls were, like the stars, obliged to remain fixed; if they were not moral spheres, endowed with freedom; with a liberty and choice to move further off and beyond the influence of the great central sun—then this concentric sun would ever keep all minds in a proper relation to God. Then all would be Excellencies—even as the stars all are —not a single Accidency. But man is not a star. He is more than the brightest star, because he is not bound by a ball and chain. He is free. And this prerogative he may and does abuse. He enjoys the sad privilege of removing himself—orbit and all—clear beyond the influence of this glorious sunshine—into the shadow—into the cold and dismal region of darkness—just as men may choose to dwell in cellars, rather than in the airy family chamber—in mines and under-ground caverns. In so far, now, as he recedes from the God-centre, departs from light and warmth, as he neutralizes the centripetal force, by the centrifugal energy of his own resistance and disobedience; as he becomes "Gott-loss,"—in the emphatic German sense—in that proportion does he become His Accidency. If his be an ordinary mind, and his orbit an ordinary orbit, the man is an ordinary Accidency. If his be a great mind, and his orbit and sphere great, then he proves His Grand Accidency. Orbit and man may be said to have collided, and become lost, as ship and sailors perish in the deep. Think of Lucifer, the lost arch-angel! And who can think, without melancholy, of many of our statesmen—who are greatness incarnate, but not excellency incarnate, —becoming lost, proving Grand Accidencies at last. It is sadder still, than if the Great Eastern were to go under, never to rise again! The greatest calamity possible is when man becomes in this sense, a lost man—His Eternal Accidency! The disso-

lution of a Humboldt mind is like the dying out of a thunderbolt. The author of "Kosmos" turning in chaos! As when a living body becomes a corpse; the corpse a trembling putrefaction; and that again dissolving into earth, ashes, dust, such is the oblivion of His Accidency.

As man remains under the influence of the centripetal sun; as his life is hid with Christ in God—as a Christian philosopher expresses it—does he become His Excellency indeed. And in proportion as a mind continues working out its destiny, in keeping ever with its innate genius, under the light and in the atmosphere of God—is that man His Grand Excellency.

There can be no greater, grander Excellency than His Grand Christian Excellency. Thus every man might prove—like the ancient Israelitish king—"a man after God's own heart."

Note. In *Martensen's Christian Dogmatics*, the reader will find this thought quite learnedly treated. Under the heading—"Man created in the image of God"—certain positions are admirably defended. He maintains, e. g. that as each human individual must be regarded as a link in the succession of the development of the genius, it is also at the same time a particular form of the Divine image, a particular and a new point of manifestation of the Divine will. The question, whether individuals are *born* or *created* is answered by separating the dross from the gold in *Traducianism* and *Creationism*. "The truth to which Traducianism may lay claim consists in this: that every human individual is a product of the natural activity of the species, just as this is determined by the peculiarities of the race, the family, and the parents. But the truth of Creationism lies in this: that the universal natural activity, by means of which the species propagates itself, and new souls are formed, that this mysterious natural activity constitutes the instrument and means for the individualizing activity of the Creator, that each single human being therefore is a new manifestation of the Divine will, which thus prepares for itself a peculiar form of its own image. Each of these views is only true, when it affirms its own antithesis. According to the one-sided view presented by Traducianism, the individual is reduced into a condition of utter dependence upon the *species*, and its whole existence is thus entirely determined by the preceding series. An eternal particularity, an infinite germ of freedom is perfectly inconceivable on the hypothesis of Traducianism, because the latter can never get beyond the notion of the *species*, and the *naturalistic* conception of the individual which is implied in it. According to a one-sided Creationism, on the other hand, every individual proceeds from the hand of his Creator as pure and undefiled as the first Adam; and the apparent dependence of the individuals upon the preceding members of the series, the notion of inherited qualities, and especially the phenomenon of natural *sinfulness* become quite inexplicable. The Scriptures acknowledge both points of view—"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," (Ps. 51:

5), are the words of the Psalmist confirming Traducianism. But at another place the Psalmist also bears witness, that the Providential eye of the Creator watches over the birth of the individual, when he says, "I will praise Thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made." "My substance was not hid from Thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect" (Ps. 139: 14–16). And the Lord says to Jeremiah, "I *formed* thee in the belly" (Jer. 1 : 5). Even if it remains a mystery, how in the secret laboratory wherein man is formed nature and creation merge in one another,—how the activity of the Creator and the conditions of nature mutually set limits to each other,—for birth has its secrets even as death has,—still must each individual be regarded at once from the point of view offered by Traducianism, and also from that of Creationism, or, in other words, as a continuation and a member in the series, and also as a new and original beginning." * * * * *

"That is a nature," is the expression we use, when we wish to say of anybody, that he is a real man, a genuine man, who has originality and character in his soul, and cannot therefore be understood by general categories of species and kind, but by the study of himself alone. But to whatever extent it can be predicated of any man that he is a nature in himself, just to that same extent does he appear before us as a *new* and original point of commencement in the series, that is to say, just so far as he appears as *natura*, to the same extent does he also appear as *creatura*."

Now, although every individual must be viewed both from the creation standpoint, and that of propagation, there is a relative difference, which must not be overlooked in the contemplation of human beings, a difference similar to the distinction which holds between creation and preservation. The more primitive and original beings are, the more readily does their first coming into existence allow an explanation on the Creation hypothesis. The less primitive they are, the more do they appear as mere shoots or offsets, from that which has preceded them—a mere continuation and prolongation of what had been previously commenced and established, and thus affording us rather a Traducian explanation. But such apparent opposition is after all only of a relative kind, since a *creation*-moment must always be presupposed in every individual, if we are to conceive of him as an individual in the image of God, and not as merely one in semblance. We hold, with others, that every human being "contains in itself an eternal idiosyncrasy, and therein, a talent given and entrusted to it by God, which, although remaining in many beings in a latent and inactive condition, must still be supposed as existent." If we ever concede the fact that the creation moment is not to be discerned in every individual case, history still forces it upon our contemplation. The *Creation* theory alone explains those groups of talent which rise upon the horizon at critical periods, and are ordained to solve the problem of the age. Such a critical period or historical dawn first breaks in upon us in great *individuals*, and these children of the dawn are not mere empty vessels, which may be filled with any sort of spirit indifferently, not mere clay out of which the particular epoch can mould whatever it may please; but much rather are they original natures with a peculiar stamp upon themselves, and more plainly visible than upon him who is a man of the masses.

The entire diversity of individuals created in God's image, of nations, of tongues, and of races, finds its unity in the Divine *Logos*, the uncreated image of God (*imago Dei absoluta*), who in the fulness of time Himself becomes man. If the Divine Logos did not Himself become man, the Ideal of Humanity would not be realized; for each of the created individuals represents only an imperfect, a relative union of the Logos and man, of the uncreated and the created Divine image. The Logos having

become a man, reveals the whole fulness of the ideal according to which human nature was originally planned, but which can be realized only imperfectly in each finite individual. If the Divine Logos did not become man, Humanity would be without any real point of unity and without a *Head*. We therefore accept the essentially Christian belief, that the Son of God would have been made man, and would have come into the world,—even if sin had not come into the world—the belief that when God created man after His own image, He created him in the image of His Son, in the image of the Son who was to become incarnate, so that even at the creation of man the image of Christ was present to the mind of the Creator, and was the prototype according to which man was created.

Art. II.—CHRIST AND HIS SPIRIT.

BY J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN, D. D.

When the Bible is spoken of as the formal principle of Christianity, in distinction from its material principle, the language means of course, simply, that the outward form in which divine revelation is presented to us in the sacred text, requires for its own completion the felt presence in it of the actual revelation itself out of which it proceeds.

There is no particular mystery in this. It is nothing more than the universal relation between speech and thought, in virtue of which the outward word must always have in it an inward word at the same time to be at all a true and full word. All spoken or written language is formal over against the inward sense it is designed to express, and this sense then is the matter or substance, without which the form of its utterance would be of no account whatever. And yet the form is not for this reason unimportant. There could be no *utterance* without it. Outward and inward, in the case, go hand in hand together. They are related to each other as soul and body.

All language is intelligible only in the element of the life from which it derives its origin. Interpreted in the element of any other life, it becomes false. The words outwardly taken cannot secure their own meaning. Only a poetic spirit, for example, can do justice to the spoken or written word of a poet; and to all unphilosophical minds, the speculations of Kant or Hegel are as a matter of course irredeemable nonsense.

And how then can it ever be otherwise with the Word of God, communicating itself to men through human forms of speech? Can these forms of themselves be possibly sufficient to convey the sense of divine revelation, into a soul not already in some living *rapport* with what the revelation is in its own nature? Here, most emphatically, the flesh, the letter, the mere outward utterance profiteth nothing. It is the spirit that quickeneth, and all right intelligence must come from within. Not simply from the interior of the human soul, in the exercise of what may be considered its own proper spiritual power of thought and contemplation; but from the illuminating and quickening spirit or life-breath of the Divine revelation itself, from which the utterance flows. The words that I speak unto you, our Saviour says, they are spirit, and they are life. They had then, and have still, their profound meaning and force only in the mystery of His own presence. Outside of that mystery they are no longer intelligible. The outward form is sundered from its inward matter, the necessary complement of its existence; and it is misconstrued at once accordingly into the service of error.

The Bible, in this way, is what it is in its own constitution and office, the sure normative rule of Christian faith in the original sense of Protestantism, only as it is itself comprehended in the presence and power of a deeper and wider supernatural fact—the historically objective and enduring fact of God's Self-revelation completing itself in the fullness of time in Christ—from which it draws its whole animating life, and to which it stands related then as an inspired archival record and attestation for the use of the Church through all ages. In that relation it is intelligible, and serves its true office of making men wise unto eternal life; otherwise not. Otherwise, indeed, it ceases to be the word of light and life. It is turned into the mere outward letter that darkens and kills.

This necessary relation between the formal and the material, the outward and the inward, in the constitution of the Holy Scriptures, is well set forth by the late excellent Dr. Ullmann in the following interesting extract on the subject:

"In what sense, then, is the Bible an outward rule?—is it

in a sense that excludes all reference to an inner rule, to something higher, deeper, broader than the written word? I reply, No! In such a sense the Bible does not itself claim to be an outer rule. That in it which is outward issued forth from what was originally inward, and has the tendency and the design always to become inward again. In thus becoming inward, it is not intended to operate as a mere outward rule, but to bear witness to itself in our inner life, and to secure our free assent. Inward and outward thus act and react on each other. If the Scripture be a rule it is fair to ask whence it came to us? It did not fall from heaven; it was not written immediately by the hand of God; it did not exist prior to Christianity. Christianity, on the contrary existed first, and the Scripture was the organ through which it presented itself to and propagated itself among men. That which existed before Scripture was the complex of saving facts, whose centre is Christ and the Christian life. The function of the Scripture, therefore, was to be the medium of making known the person and work of Christ, where the living message could not reach. For this reason its position and work are not unconditional. Christ it is who conditions Scripture, and gives it its worth. It is not the Scripture that gives authority to Christ, but Christ to Scripture. The proper object of faith is Christ, not the Scripture; the latter is merely the guide and educator unto Christ" (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1852).

Here then we have the full conception of the material principle or "inner rule" of Christian truth, in its difference from the formal principle or "outer rule" presented to us in the Bible. It holds in *the direct union of Christian faith with the one only full object and necessary complement of all such faith, the fullness of God's self-revelation in the person of His Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*

What less than this, in fact, have we in what St. John declares to have been the burden of the teaching of Jesus to the Jews (John xii. 44–46): "He that believeth on Me, believeth not on Me, but on Him that sent Me! And he that seeth Me, seeth Him that sent me! I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on Me should not abide in darkness!"

I. Private Judgment or False Freedom.

However it may have been with any past period or time, it is only too plain that in our age the power of distinguishing clearly between the formal and material sides of Protestant Christianity has been in large measure lost, and that the result is a general substitution now, on all sides, of the formal principle for the material. In other words, the Bible is at once identified with Revelation; the idea of the book is made to be synonymous with the objective supernatural reality, of which it is the record and report; and so the book is taken to be of itself all the principle that is required to sustain the entire structure of the Christian faith in every farther view. To talk of any other ground of faith requiring to be joined with this ground, in order to make it full and firm, is held to be a dishonor put upon the Bible, as making it not to be the one only rule of faith, which the Protestant world has held it to be from the beginning. How can it be such an absolute rule or measure of truth, it is asked, if it must be itself ruled or measured by any normative authority from beyond itself? A regulated regulator is considered to be here a simple contradiction in terms. To be what the case is supposed to require, the Bible must be all or nothing. It must be for Christianity, both formal principle and material principle in one. The whole weight of God's word or revelation to men must rest upon the Divine Book, as its only actual basis. The Bible thus is converted into the very pillar and ground of the truth, and becomes virtually the fundamental "rock" on which Christ's Church is built, and against which He has assured us the gates of hell shall not prevail.

It is not only here and there, that we meet with this confusion of thought and speech in our modern religious life. It has taken possession of it, more or less, in all directions and in all forms. It is the grand staple of our evangelical literature in one direction, and of our openly rationalistic and humanitarian literature in another direction. From both sides hands are joined, and voices united, in singing loud hallelujahs to the Bible, as being in and of itself (under God's Spirit working in

a general way on man's spirit) the source of all necessary illumination and life rectification for our sin-troubled world. Our pulpits are harping continually on this string. For one that preaches Christ as the ever-living, ever-present, ever-working WORD in the Church, there are ten (orthodox and unorthodox alike) that are all the time exalting the Written Word in His place, and using it (a thing to make angels weep!) not to show forth, but rather to eclipse and keep out of sight the ineffable brightness of the Father's glory shining in and through His Person.

So with our religious papers. Where among them generally do we find power to "hold forth the word of life," in the way of which I am now speaking, as something different from the moral and religious teachings of the Bible? Our denominational periodicals on all sides are forever appealing to the Bible, as the sure infallible test of truth, and the end of all controversy; but with little or almost no serious attempt to face God's actual revelation that lies behind the Bible, and to see if there might not be possibly there what is needed to make the Bible a very principle of peace and concord, instead of its being as it is now largely, through wrong use, a principle of interminable confusion and strife. As things stand now, Dr. Bellows and H. W. Beecher, so far as we can see, operate Christianity exactly alike, on one and the same false pivot or hinge, namely, the Bible regarded simply as a heaven-appointed codex of Christian theology and morals. Nor are we able to see at all, that the case is any better, in a comparison of the "New York Observer," for example, with the "Independent," or even with Theodore Tilton's brilliant "Golden Age," published in the same city. They are all great on the Bible. Mr. Tilton in particular, with no belief apparently in its supernatural origin at all, *honors* the New Testament as the best of books; reads it, we are told, diligently; and even patronizes the wisdom of the Jewish Rabbi, Jesus Christ, so far as to accept the Sermon on the Mount for his own Confession of Faith. But why marvel at this? Is it not a notorious fact, that our openly worldly papers, for whom the chief end of man lies only in the things

of this life, are quite able and willing now also to use the Scriptures as the golden norm of morality and religion in the same independent style? The N. Y. "World," "Tribune," and "Herald," for example, find no difficulty in setting themselves up in this way, on occasions to their mind just and fit, as peers in full with the evangelical ministry of the land, in the great business of religious teaching; using the Bible for the purpose, like Blackstone's Commentaries on the Common Law, as it seems to read from their simply secular and mundane standpoint.

And with our religious books it is no better. It is amazing, how even learned and good men, undertaking to instruct the world on the most important themes, in this way, appear for the most part to lose sight altogether of the difference there is between Divine Revelation and the Bible, and to deal with the whole subject of Christianity, as if it rested on the authority of the Bible simply and no other ground. Take one respectable example only; the volume of the famous "Essays and Reviews," which raised such a commotion a few years ago in the Anglican Church. Occupied throughout with the subject of Christian Evidence, they nevertheless get nowhere beyond points and questions touching the outward constitution of the Holy Scriptures. We do not remember to have found in them from beginning to end, a single recognition of the material principle of Christianity, as holding in the immediate and direct apprehension of the one grand Object of all real Christian faith, our glorious Redeemer Jesus Christ. And although we have not read the learned and pious answers they called forth from high sources, we question much if any one of them has proceeded otherwise than from the same false premises, and toward a like wrong end.

What is here complained of is still a reigning vice of our English and American theology. It is matter for congratulation, however, that in Germany the case is now in some measure different. Both the friends and the foes of Christianity there understand, or are at least coming more and more to understand, that the question of its authority lies deeper than the

Bible. As one has said: "The grand characteristic revolution of religious thought in our modern time, consists in this, that the ground-stone and centre of Christianity are viewed as existing not in a Book, but in a Person, not in a scheme of doctrine, but in actual facts and operations." Let us hope, that our American Protestantism may yet come also, in no great while, to look at the subject in the same way. We need not fear that the Bible will be shorn of any part of its honor, by coming thus in right relation to Christ. Only then can it ever be truly itself, when it is felt to be outwardly the very presence itself of the "inner word," from which originally it drew its breath of life. Then only will it be the Bible in full, when it has become thus "all glorious within."

For, in truth, it is no real dignification of the Holy Scriptures, that they should be made ostensibly to bear the entire weight of Christianity in the bad way, of which we are now speaking. On the contrary by being thus sundered and cut off from their own proper life in the actual objective revelation from which they have sprung, and to which they rightly belong, they must necessarily come under the power of a new foreign life altogether different from their own. For no book can teach independently of a living element in some form beyond itself, in and through which it is read and understood; and if this be not the element of its own life, then must it be for the book a false element, by which its true sense is sure to be misconstrued and wronged. So if the Bible be not complemented by the material principle of a true Christian faith in felt communication with the "powers of the world to come," of which it is the product and exponent throughout, it cannot fail to have forced upon it, in place of this, a spurious complementation in some other form. It will not be, and cannot be, abstractly independent. It will still have its material principle; but this now only as an element of mere human fancy or thought, sure to darken ultimately its true sense, instead of making it clear and plain (1 Cor. ii. 11–14).

This is that bad so-called private judgment, which affects to find in the naked Bible all things necessary to salvation, by

taking it simply as a body of logically intelligible doctrines and rules, open to any good natural understanding, and then gathering out of the whole a sense to suit itself; not seeing or knowing that it is in fact all the time, in this way, making the Bible the reflection merely of its own at best simply humanitarian spirit, instead of entering at all into the true supernatural spirit of the Bible itself.

This may be either with supposed and professed belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures, or without any such belief. But that difference, for the point here in hand, does not amount to much. In either case, the appreciation of what the Bible means and wills is drawn, not from any true faith sense of the general higher life in which it has its actual home, but from the sense simply of what it is directly for a given moral or spiritual experience without this; and the appreciation in that view, of course, can never be otherwise than more or less seriously defective and false.

An interesting and instructive example of such defective estimation of the significance of the Bible, we have in one of Mr. H. W. Beecher's "Plymouth Pulpit" sermons, where we find him not long since undertaking to deal with the great and difficult subject, *The Inspiration of Scripture*, for the benefit of his people and the world at large.

The sermon is of course in Mr. Beecher's usual pulpit style. There are good thoughts in it, points well put, reaches of spirit in the right direction, and genial dashes of thought here and there toward great truths. But he cannot be said to have thrown much light on the dark question he feels himself called upon here to grapple with, unless it be that sort of light only which serves to "make darkness visible."

The times, we are reminded rightly, are rank with the spirit of religious unbelief. Heretofore skepticism was more on the surface of life, more simply outward and occasional, and "required but comparatively little to remove it." There was one agency, in particular, sufficiently potent for that purpose; "for many revivals of religion," we are told, "have been the instruments in the hand of God, by which such unbelief has been

blown away like so much chaff." But we are now beyond that. The devil of modern unbelief is too deeply seated in the reigning spirit of the age to be expelled on any such easy terms. Doubt sits everywhere in the air. We are taking it in all the time unconsciously, in the breath of our daily life. It has poisoned the fountains of our social culture. It is the soul of our reigning literature and education. The scientific and moral consciousness of the world is steeped in it more deeply, it would seem, than ever in any age before. The object of this general doubt is the Word of God; and for Mr. Beecher, the Word of God is at once the Bible. What the age needs above all things, then, especially the young men of the age, (to whom in particular this pastoral enchiridion is directed), is to have confidence well and surely fortified in the Divine origin and Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures.

For, as Mr. Beecher well says, "a state of doubt in respect of the Word of God is, in its practical consequences, just as fatal as unbelief." If the mariner at sea only question the accuracy of his compass, all trust in the course he is steering is gone. And so it is with the Christian's compass, the Bible. "To be of value to you or to me, it must be as implicitly believed in as our own existence; and if there come from any quarter such a degree of disturbance of faith, that we are uncertain about the substantial element of its truth, to us it is blotted out as a power." Hence, then, the vast importance of being fully assured that the Bible is in very truth God's infallible impregnable Word. That must be taken as the ground truth of Christianity, on which all its other truths depend. Faith must start there, first of all, and from this fulcrum, operate throughout in all its apprehensions of the Divine and supernatural under other forms. All Christian theology and religion thus depend on what are called the "Evidences of Christianity," brought to bear on the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, regarded as the necessary text and voucher of revelation in any wider view.

And yet these *evidences* in the usual form are not altogether to Mr. Beecher's taste. He feels that they are after all not

just the thing most needed to uphold Christian faith, and that there ought to be, and must be in some way, a more compendious and comprehensive argument for the truth of God's Word drawn directly from the constitution of the Word itself. Here we have one of those deeper divinations in his thinking, to which I have before referred, that seem to carry him at times beyond his own general stand-point, without, however, setting him free from it in fact. What he is reaching after, is the idea of a material principle of revealed religion, as something different from all questions touching the form of its outward revelation in the Bible; but what he rests in ultimately as such a principle falls painfully short of this idea in its proper truth.

"There is nothing," he says, "that I feel so incompetent to do as to adjudicate on these external questions. And I do not believe, that one young man in a thousand is competent to inquire into them and decide them. But I am competent to know whether the truth is better than a lie; and so are you. I am competent to know what elements go to make true manhood; and so are you. I am competent to know whether it is best that men should have immortality hereafter, or die like beasts; and so are you. I am competent to know, that love is better than hatred; and so are you. Inspirations may be given to you and to me to understand the Bible, just as they were originally given to men who wrote the Bible. Spiritual purity and divine love are the elements which go to constitute the great doctrine of God, whether they be constructed into a theory or not. We have a knowledge of certain great truths, which are beyond peradventure. There is given to all a moral instinct which you cannot throw out; or which, if you do throw it out, will come back like a dove to its window. There is in every man a moral consciousness that interprets truth, that opens up communion between God and man, that lights the candle of the future, and that inspires hope therein. There is in you, and in me, an almost unerring guide—a truly unerring guide, if we be honest with ourselves—in respect to the vital portions of Scripture. The external history of the Bible is beyond our reach, except so far as we, as docile scholars, receive

it, as others bear witness concerning it; but the internal part of the Bible we can know; and it is our fault if we do not know it."

This, and more in the same strain, we have from Mr. Beecher, as the all-sufficient internal evidence for the truth of the Bible, on the strength of which he declares himself "not a particle afraid" of the infidel assaults that are made upon it in our age; though from his way of taking off his hat again to the magisterial claims of modern natural science,* it might almost seem as if his high air were only put on for effect—a sort of "whistling to keep his courage up." Against all doubts and difficulties, rolling in upon him like a flood, he throws forward boldly the mighty bulwark of what the Bible is practically for the moral nature of man. "Its internal elements," as thus related to human life, "are inexpugnable." The book in this way, he assures us, authenticates itself. "My belief in the Bible is founded on actual experience."

Now I have no wish to undervalue this form of internal evidence. It has great value in its proper place. But can it, of itself, demonstrate for faith the divine origin and infallible authority of the Scriptures? Not any more, I reply, than the external evidences of miracles or prophecies. Such assurance of faith can come only through the direct apprehension of the revelation itself, in the bosom of which the book called the Bible stands. That is the material factor in all true Bible faith. It is the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti*, the witness of the Holy Ghost, of which such solemn account was made in the age of the Reformation. Mr. Beecher imagines probably, that his experimental test is that witness. But he is mistaken. The Reformers meant by it something very different and far more grand. *Their* authenticating principle was the Divine Object

* "If Scripture is from God (he says), so the outward world is from the hand of God. And God will not tell lies. He will not contradict in one revelation what He has written in another. And if the Word of God is so construed that it is brought into conflict with the truths that are outside of it, something must give way—human interpretations or divine facts—and facts will not! Go ahead, then, ye men of science. Tell us what the Bible may and must mean; and that for our faith then it *shall* mean!"

itself, from which the Bible derives all its supernatural evidence and force. *His* authenticating principle is at best the voice of the human soul, singly or collectively taken, responding subjectively to the moral and spiritual teachings of the Bible. In this last case all turns on Man and Humanity; in the other case all turns on God and His Son Jesus Christ.

It should be startling to Mr. Beecher himself, an earnestly thoughtful man as he is, that his "inexpugnable" demonstration of the truth of the Scriptures, for the benefit of the young men of his congregation, should hold entirely outside of the central mystery of all revelation, Jesus Christ. He is barely named once or twice as a circumstance, in the general humanitarian line of proof. And yet, is He not the alpha and omega of both Testaments? Is He not the self-evidencing light of the entire new Christian creation? And how, then, can any Christian evidence, any argument for the *Inspiration of Scripture*, without HIM, end otherwise than in thick darkness?

Beyond all question, Dr. Ullmann is right in affirming that it is not Scripture which gives authority to Christ, but Christ who gives authority to Scripture. We have the same thought from Dr. Ebrard, where he says in his Christian Theology: "We cannot first prove from this and that the inspiration of the Bible, and then draw the conclusion that we are to believe in all it contains, and among other things, also in Christ; but we must first have come, by means of the Scripture, to know and love Christ as our Redeemer, and to experience His redemption in ourselves; then we pass through faith in Christ to faith in His Written Word."

II. Ecclesiasticism or False Authority.

Rationalists, of course, and all who wish to bring down Christianity to the level of a mere secular morality and culture, see no difficulty in resting the whole weight of Protestantism on the authority of the Bible, taken in that outward and abstract way of which we have now spoken. For this at once puts the word of God, as they call it, into their own hands, and they have it in their power then to make the sacred text mean just what they, with their secular mind and spirit, think it ought to

mean. They are, however, bad Protestants always, and traitors to the true cause of the Reformation, who thus, under cover of the outward Scripture, put forward the natural reason of the world, instead of God's own living revelation, as the true material sense of the Scriptures. And so it is not strange, then, that we find Roman Catholics most ready to fall in from the opposite side with this false view of the Bible principle of Protestantism, and pleased enough to accept it as the great turning point of their controversy with Protestants in regard to the rule of faith. In this way they contrive, in fact, to beg the whole question in their own favor, from the very outset, by the vicious and false form in which the question is put.

Take the following specimen of such unfair assumption with regard to the Protestant rule, from a somewhat elaborate article in a late number of the "Catholic World," on *Authority in Matters of Faith.* "No one can read the Bible," we are told, "without perceiving, that it neither is nor professes to be the original medium of the Christian revelation to man, but from first to last supposes a revelation previously made, the true religion to have been already taught, and instructions in it already received. This is true of the Old Testament, and more especially true of the New Testament; and we know historically, and nobody denies it, that the faith was preached and believed, and particular churches, congregations of believers were gathered and organized, before a word of the New Testament was written. The Protestant, reduced to the sacred text, even supposing he has the genuine and authentic text, and his private judgment, would be reduced to the condition of the lawyer, who should undertake to explain the statutes of any one of our States, in total ignorance of the Common Law, or without reference to it or the decisions of common law courts. Now and then a statute, perhaps, would explain itself, but in most cases he would be wholly at a loss as to the real meaning of the legislature." Again, "The Protestant needs to know the Christian faith in order to interpret the sacred text and ascertain it from the Bible, and this he cannot know by his own private judgment or develop from his own 'inner consciousness,' since

it lies in the supernatural order, and is above the reach of his natural faculties. It is clear, then, that in the Bible interpreted by private judgment, he has, and can have, only a fallible authority. It is not because the Holy Scriptures do not contain, explicitly or implicitly, the whole faith, that, interpreted by private judgment, they give only a fallible rule of faith, but because, to find the faith in its unity and integrity in them, we must know it *aliunde* and beforehand. This difficulty is completely obviated by the Catholic rule."

Now, I repeat, there is unfairness in this. It assumes throughout, that the Protestant rule of faith is the Bible interpreted by simple private judgment, without regard to the supernatural fact of the Christian faith itself, in whose bosom only the Bible has been from the beginning, and still is, really and truly, the Word of God. But it is no better than a caricature of genuine Protestantism, whether on the part of pretended friends or open foes, to represent it in this way. In the name of all sound and right-minded Protestantism, the representation must be pronounced false. It was from no such poor abstract use of the Bible, that the Reformation took its rise in the beginning. Neither Luther, nor Zwingli, nor Melancthon, nor Calvin, professed at all to stand upon the principle of the Bible and private judgment in any such naked view. They had a very clear sense of Christianity as a Divine historical fact, which had come down to them through the general life of the Church along with the Bible, an objective matter of faith in this form, which was for them older and deeper than the text of the Bible; and it was just the assurance of this, first of all, which threw them on the authority of that outward original record, then, over against what they held to be the false outward rule of the Roman Church. The Bible was for them a valid, formal rule of faith only in and through the presence of the material faith itself (something immeasurably different from natural private judgment), which it was felt to enshrine. Of this there is no room for any question or doubt. And what all true Protestantism was thus in the beginning, in opposition to false biblical freedom no less than to false ecclesiastical author-

ity, that all true Protestantism is still, in spite of the fond agreement of Rationalists and Romanists to consider it something else.

So far as the quotation just made from the "Catholic World" goes, then, it means just nothing at all for its own end. There is no reason, why it should not be accepted in full by any sound Protestant as a true declaration of what he himself holds and believes. Certainly we know, so far as we are in our senses, that the Bible, "from first to last, supposes a revelation previously made," in the abiding light and power of which only, it can be rightly interpreted and understood. Certainly we know, that the "Protestant needs to know the Christian faith in order to interpret the sacred text and ascertain it from the Bible;" and we are very sure also, that "this he cannot know by his own private judgment or develop from his own inner consciousness, since it lies in the supernatural order and is above the reach of his natural faculties." All this the genuine Protestant knows and admits as freely as the genuine Catholic. It is not *here* that we are met with the real difference between their respective rules of faith. It is a pure *petitio principii* to put the question which divides them in any such form. The two rules rightly understood, and not libellously misrepresented, rest on the same general idea and have in view the same object. The idea, is that of an infallible supernatural revelation, underlying the fact of Christianity in the world and making itself known through the Bible and the actual life of the Church; the object aimed at, is the sure determination of the sense of this infallible revelation, which all can see to be something quite as needful for its purpose as its own infallibility. An infallible regulation for Christian faith, subjected to a fallible exposition of its meaning, must itself, of course, also cease to be infallible. As to this both sides are agreed; as they are agreed also in holding, that the true sense of revelation "lies in the supernatural order and is therefore above the reach of man's simply natural faculties." The only question is, then: From what quarter, and in what form, is that infallible teaching to be obtained, which all sound Protestants and

Catholics alike consider indispensable for any full and complete faith in the Christian Revelation? Without this necessary complement, no rule of faith, Catholic or Protestant, can be more than a figment of unbelief entitled as such to no regard whatever; but in what way, now, is the complement, the necessary filling out of the otherwise formal rule on either side, to be so reached as to furnish the ground that is needed for an infallible Christian faith? That is the question. Protestantism (genuine and not spurious Protestantism) answers it in one manner; Roman Catholicism answers it in another manner. And just here, not elsewhere, we are confronted in full with the difference which separates the two systems in regard to the Rule of Faith.

The article in the "Catholic World" just noticed and quoted, is very clear on what is to be considered the Roman Catholic doctrine on this subject. Take the following brief and comprehensive statement:

"The Church has in Catholic tradition, which she preserves intact by time or change, the whole revelation, whether written or unwritten, and in this tradition she has the key to the real sense of the sacred Scriptures, and is able to interpret them infallibly. Tradition, authenticated by the Church as the witness and depository of it, supplies the knowledge necessary to the understanding of the sacred text. Read in the light of tradition, what is implicit in the text becomes explicit, what is merely referred to as wholly known becomes expressly and clearly stated, and we are able to understand the written word, because tradition interprets it for us, without any demand for a knowledge or judgment on our part that exceeds our natural powers. Our judgment is no longer private judgment, because we have in tradition a catholic rule by which to judge, and our judgment has not to pass on anything above the province of reason."

There is great convenience in this certainly, and it has the advantage of making faith very simple and easy. But only look now at the details of the scheme, as they are made to pass before us with logical severity, by the writer of the article himself; and see to what at last this infallible authority in matters

of faith comes. It is altogether outward and mechanical, and is simply in the end the abstract Bible rule over again, only metamorphosed for the time into another complexion and phase. All that the rule pretends to do, in fact, is to furnish us a form-principle of faith, which of itself still fails to place us in any felt communion with the ultimate supernatural matter of faith. A very different view of faith, all deeply earnest minds must feel, from that which is presented to us in the writings either of St. Paul or of St. John.

The logic of the case runs succinctly thus:—"Faith or belief agrees with knowledge in the respect that it is intellectual assent, but differs from it in that it is mediate assent, by an authority extrinsic, as authority or evidence, both to the object and to the person. The authority or evidence mediates between the mind and the fact or object, and brings them together in a manner somewhat analogous to that in which the middle term in the syllogism brings together the two extremes and unites them in the conclusion." This middle term for the Christian faith we have in the historical Church, which stands as an outside authority or witness between men and the supernatural truths of Christianity, and authenticates them for their rational belief. All that men need in the case is sufficient evidence to their natural reason, that the Church has been commissioned by God to accredit the mysteries of the Christian religion to the world in this external way. "That evidence, called by theologians *motives of credibility*, found complete, all the rest follows as a logical consequence;" and the believer is not called upon at all to join his finite judgment in any way with the infinite and absolute. "All that one has to believe of the infinite and absolute, after he has established by evidence appropriate in the case the divine institution and commission of the Church, he believes on the authority of the Church herself." God exists; God is truth; God's word, then, is infallibly true. "So far we can go by science or certain knowledge." The highest possible reason for believing is thus God's word itself, in case we are only assured that it is His word. Now for us the word of God is His revelation, a certain body of formal truth published from

heaven for our instruction and use. "Suppose, then, that He made His revelation, and deposited it with the Apostles whom He commanded to go forth and teach it to all men and nations. The Apostles would, on this supposition, be competent and credible witnesses to the fact, that God made and deposited His revelation with them. Suppose farther, that the Apostles transmitted it to their successors, or rather, that the Church is the identical Apostolical body continued without any interruption or break, down to our time, the Church would then be a competent and credible witness to the fact of revelation and to what is revealed. Being the eye-witness of the facts which proved our Lord a teacher come from God and authorized to speak in His name, and the depositary of the revelation, her testimony is conclusive." This leaves only one point more to be proved, namely, the historical identity of the modern Roman Catholic Church with the Apostolic body thus made the outward depository of the faith in the beginning; and that is too plain, we are told, to admit of any serious question. So we have the whole question in a nutshell, without any mystery about it. "The points to be proved are in fact exceedingly few, and those not above the reach of private judgment or difficulty. The authority of our Lord as a teacher come from God was proved by miracles. These miracles the Church witnesses and testifies to as facts, and so far her testimony is unimpeachable. Their supernatural and miraculous character we can ourselves judge of. Whether they prove the divine authority of Jesus or not, is also a matter of which we are competent to judge. His divine authority proved, His divinity, and all the mysteries of His person can be rationally accepted on His word, and what His word was, the Church who received it is competent to declare!" Belief in this way is not blind; it acts on a reason.

The Catholic rule here is, indeed, supremely rational, or let us say supranaturalistically rationalistic. "There is no belief," our Catholic friends tell us, "where there is no intellectual conviction. The authority we assert is the *reason* for believing; it is the *medius terminus* that unites the credible object and the creditive subject, and renders the belief possible and an intel-

lectual act, and so far assimilates it to knowledge. Belief without authority is belief without any ground or reason for believing, and is irrational, unfounded, mere credulity, as when one believes a rumor for which there is no authority. When the authority is worthy of credit, the belief is warranted, and when it is infallible, the belief is infallible. In believing what the Church teaches me in the word of God, I have infallible authority for my belief, and cannot be deceived, mistaken or err." The authority to teach having been established on the part of the Church "all the rest follows logically and necessarily, as in the syllogism the conclusion follows from the premises."

This is the so-called Catholic rule of faith, an infallible Church instead of a simply infallible Bible. The two theories are alike in this, that the rule in each case is taken to be an outward middle term, mediating between the fallible judgment of men on the one side, and the objective truth of God's revelation on the other side; and so the question rises, how is such fallible private judgment any better off with the one rule than with the other? In either case its own fallibility in the use of the rule, would seem to neutralize and nullify the merely formal infallibility of the rule itself. This difficulty, it is true the Catholic holds to be completely obviated so far as his rule is concerned, by the consideration that it is a living rule, which can be called in at all times to settle questions of faith and practice as they arise from one age to another; a service like that of a living court of justice in its last resort for our civil and political life. But to what can such infallible teaching amount, however, for fallible private judgment, in the case supposed, when it is found that it has in it after all, no more power than the infallible teaching of the Bible itself to bring the private judgment into any real union with the matter of the Christian faith as it is, in its own supernatural sphere?

For, strange to say, to this it comes in the end with our Catholic infallible rule of faith. Its method of certainty and proof, we are distinctly told, "however sure and however faithfully followed, does not suffice to make one a Catholic, or to give one true Catholic and divine faith, or faith as a theologi

cal virtue; it only removes the obstacles in the way of the intellect in believing, and yields only what theologians call human faith—*fides humana*—which really advances one not a single step towards the kingdom of God, or living union with Christ."

There is a confusion here which is bewildering for the whole question in debate. The question professedly regards the true rule of Christian faith, which, as such, has to do with supernatural verities in their own order, and so needs to be nothing less than infallible in the same sense with the verities themselves. But it turns out now that the Catholic rule *per se* does not pretend to be sufficient for faith in that sense. It is not divine faith at all that it is ground and authority for, but only human faith, the easy credence of natural reason given to well authenticated human testimony. And yet the talk of "authority in matters of faith" refers itself ostensibly, nevertheless, all the time, to the New Testament idea of faith, as though that were the idea with which it had to do throughout. There is a logomachy in the case, in this way, a playing fast and loose with the term faith, which is neither logical nor edifying.

But take it either way, the theory which puts the Church as an outward authority between Christian faith and its supernatural object, which makes the Church a middle term between Christ and the true believer, external to both, and holding them asunder in the form of such mechanical conjunction, is a theory that cannot possibly be made to harmonize with the New Testament, and that must ever do violence to the inmost sanctuary of the religious consciousness. Religion holds fundamentally and essentially in the union of man with God, and this to be at all real must be in the mode of inward personal life; must be through the free activity of the soul taking hold directly of God Himself. All revelation has for its object to make such union possible. It is God's drawing near to men, that they may be enabled to draw near to Him. And just that is the meaning and purpose most especially of His last, nearest and fullest possible approach to us in our fallen estate, the "epiphany of the kindness and philanthropy of God, our Sa-

viour," as St. Paul calls it (Tit. iii. 4), which took place when, in the Person of His eternal Son, He became Man for us men, and for our salvation. That epiphany itself, was no outside testimony simply concerning God; in the sense that was uppermost in the mind of Nicodemus, for example, when he said, "No man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him;" which is, in fact, also the sense of rationalistic supernaturalism generally (whether Catholic or Protestant) in its view of the Saviour's mission and commission. The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ was no middle term of a syllogism, but the direct and full manifestation of God Himself. And as such again, then, it also could not in the beginning, and it cannot now, either require or allow the interposition of any purely outside middle term, between itself and the believer's soul, as the ultimate *ground* and authority of his Christian faith. What are called the Evidences of Christianity in that outside viiew, may be of force for logical understanding, but they can never in and of themselves, warrant or produce the faith that is spoken of in the 11th Chapter of the Epistle to theHebrews; and so also no authority, either of the Bible or of the Church, in like separate and abstract form, can ever make them sufficient for this purpose. This does not mean that miracles are not evidence, or that the Bible and the Church have no mediating office to serve in conducting our faith to Christ. Miracles, Bible and Church are to Him, what the outflowing light of the day is to the sun. They are a necessary part of His self-revelation. The revelation without them would be gnostically unreal and inconceivable. But just for this reason, what they are as evidence and authority, is not a prelimimary outside verification of Christ, a logical middle term bridging the way for faith over to His presence. It is only the actual showing forth of the glory of Christ in them and through them, that makes them to be at all credible witnesses to His glory.

The theory, then, which makes the Church, outwardly and abstractly considered, to be the pillar and ground of Christian truth, the basis of the new creation in Christ Jesus, the fundamental authority for men in matters of faith, is as little ten-

able, as the theory which makes the Bible to be all this under the same outwardly formal and abstract view. We believe in the Bible, and we believe in the Holy Catholic Church, holding its right place in the order of the Creed; but we cannot put either of them into the place which the Creed assigns to Christ. We do not believe in either of them as the principle or ground of Christianity. As it is not Scripture which gives authority to Christ, according to what we have seen before, but Christ who gives authority to Scripture; so neither is it the Church which authenticates Christ, but Christ who authenticates the Church.

III. Ubi Spiritus, Ibi Et Veritas.

The way now lies open before us for the full understanding of what we may call the grand motive power of the Reformation in its original and proper wholeness. The power takes its course between the two extremes of false freedom and false authority (the one self-entrenched in the Bible and the other in the Church, in the one-sided manner we have seen), and does this so as to take up the true force of what each aims to be as a rule of faith into its own higher movement. The ideas of freedom and authority here, as everywhere in our human life, condition each other, and are indeed polar opposites in their very nature that mutually seek and demand one another for their own completion. Thrown asunder, and made to stand apart, they become abstractions, and appear both alike only as hollow and empty forms. Neither Bible nor Church can be the full principle of Christianity by itself; and just as little can they be this together by any merely outward conjunction. Both, in and of themselves, are but formal principles, and need alike to be complemented by the material faith of the Gospel joined to them from another source altogether.

In the case of the *Church*, it is admitted even by Romanists themselves, as we have seen, that its authority as a rule of faith in the view here stated, is defective. It has no power, in and of itself, to "join the finite judgment of man with the infinite and the absolute;" while yet just this, and nothing short of this, as we know, is the necessary character of the

supernatural mystery, with which all true Christian faith is ultimately concerned. The rule can only be taken thus as a natural reason for accepting the truth of the mystery, as this may be put into terms apprehensible for the natural understanding; just as one may believe, on credible human testimony, what he has never himself seen in the remote depths of Asia or Africa. The faith thus reached on the authority of the Church is then, by its own confession, only human faith. It is in no sense divine faith; it has in it no supernatural quality whatever; nothing really and truly correlative, therefore, with the supernatural character of its object. This object it has no power to touch or reach, as it is in its own nature in any way. For as the "Catholic World" with truth says, "reason can construct no bridge over which one can pass from the natural to the supernatural; the bridge must be constructed by grace; faith, the beginning of the Christian life, is the gift of God." How the gift comes is not here the question. It is only certain, that it does not of itself lie in owning the outward formal authority of the Church.

Neither does it lie, however, as has also been sufficiently shown, in owning the outward formal authority of the *Bible.* Taken alone, the Bible can never be more at best than a dead rule, depending for its sense necessarily, on its proper interpretation; and the only key that can interpret it rightly is the Christian faith itself, which then is faith not first and immediately in the authority of the Bible as such, but in the authority of the Divine revelation, to which the Bible secondarily belongs. As an outside witness before this, bearing testimony to divine truth, the utmost to which it can reach can only be of one order with that outside testimony of the Church, which also as we have seen is able at best only to produce natural or human faith without any power whatever to be the ground of true supernatural and saving faith. In this case, as in the other, the outward can form no efficient middle term for a logical transition of the judgment over to the inward. "Reason can construct no bridge" from Bible premises abstractly taken, any more than from Church premises abstractly taken,

"over which one can pass from the natural to the supernatural; the bridge must be constructed by grace; faith, the beginning of the Christian life, is the gift of God." So all really evangelical Protestants are ready to confess, as freely as all really spiritually-minded Catholics.

In this respect, then, the Bible as a rule of faith, and the Church as a rule of faith, stand in one line. Infallible each in its own order and way, they cannot, either of them, as from themselves, generate infallible faith. For faith, to be infallible, must be the apprehension of the supernatural *as supernatural*, and not an outward notion merely of the supernatural as natural. It is, St. Paul tells us, *ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων* (Heb. xi. 1), the substantiation of things hoped for, the evidence or demonstration of things not seen; a real bridging over, in this way, of the otherwise impassable chasm, that holds between the natural understanding of men and heavenly realities. No simply reason-wrought trust in the Church, however blind and unquestioning, amounts to this; and no simply reason-wrought trust in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, however in its own conceit free and independent, amounts to this. What thus begins in natural reason on both sides, ends necessarily in natural reason on both sides. The simply human premises necessitate a simply human conclusion, and have no power whatever to lift themselves up to the height of the divine argument that is required for the production of a truly divine faith.

There is, however, a great truth of course on both sides. Church and Scripture are alike necessary to the full idea of Christianity, and neither can be thrust aside, or absolutely subjected to the separate authority of the other, without serious damage to Christian faith.

The idea of the *Church*, in the first place, lies essentially in the idea of Christianity (and indeed in the idea of religion universally), just as the lower idea of the State lies also in the social nature of man as related simply to the present world. No form of human existence can be complete in an isolated or atomistic view; but only as it holds in organized conjunction

with its own order of existence in a general view, and is comprehended along with this in the continuous flow of human history. This law applied to the highest form of human existence, the fullness of the life of humanity in its union with God (religion brought to its absolute completeness in and by Christ), gives us of itself at once the ideal constitution of the Christian Church, with all its necessary attributes, as it is made to be one of the articles of our "undoubted Christian faith" in the ancient œcumenical Creeds. And it is easy enough surely to see, how the truth of Christianity must be conditioned always for the faith of men, on to the end of the world, by the actual historical continuity of the Christian life itself in this general form, age after age. The Church in such view always has been, and always must be, the necessary witness of Christian truth. In no other way can the presence of Christianity in the world be considered historical; which yet it must be to be really human; for only that which is taken into the actual flow of human life can be regarded as belonging to the true being of human life, and that is just the conception of history.

But the historical character of Christianity requires no less, in the second place, that it should remain bound, through all its course, to the supernatural fountain-head, from which in the beginning it took its rise; and it is just to serve this necessary purpose, that the *Holy Scriptures* have been provided in the wisdom of God, and that they continue indispensable through all ages, along with the Church, for the maintenance and right regulation of true Christian faith. What is wanted for the continuity of a historical existence, is not just outward permanence as of a pyramid, nor mere onward flow as of a river, but together with this the felt sense and consciousness of perennial comprehension in the original power of what the existence has been from the beginning; in such sort that the life and soul of the beginning shall endure as it were, in the whole movement onward to the end. So in the case of Christianity, especially, no simply onflowing witness and tradition through the Church, all important though this be in the way we have

just seen, is enough of itself to secure its historical identity; the ecclesiastical tradition (if it is to be living and not dead), needs to be kept fresh and green continually through direct contact with the supernatural facts themselves, from which it took its rise in the beginning. In that sense it is, that the Apostolic period of Christianity, the birth-age of the Gospel, is normative for all later ages of Christianity. It is so, not immediately by its doctrinal ideas and teachings, but by its heavenly facts, the inspiring vital air of the new-born mysteries, in the midst of which, eighteen hundred years ago, it breathed and had its being. The chasm between it and the time following, in that view, is very broad and deep, as we are all made to feel in passing from the New Testament to the early Christian fathers. It is not through any after report merely of later times, then, that the birth-age of Christianity can exert its proper normative influence on Christian history; there must be for this purpose the possibility of its being known and felt continually in the direct power of its own life. And for this there would seem to be only one sufficiently sure way, namely, the transcript of that life into the outward form of the Written Word.

Here it is that the true glory of the Holy Scriptures, accordingly, comes into view. It is not as an outward dictation of thought for the minds of men, or of language for their lips; not as the mere utterance of divine oracles for the understanding in any way, that the Bible comes before us in its proper character, or reveals to us the full grandeur of its mission. It owes its importance wholly to this, that it is the original record and document, in all its parts, of the divine history to which it owes its existence. Like any other original document in this view, it holds embalmed in itself the spirit of the past life it represents, and has the power of making this live itself over again, beyond all later writings or traditions; only with the difference, that *here* the life represented is in its own nature supernatural and indestructible, and that the record which tells of it has been itself born forth directly from the same divine element, so as to be in very deed "the word of God which liveth and abideth

forever." The New Testament, in this way, is not the Christian Revelation; it has never pretended to be that; and it can never be anything better than superstitious bibliolatry, or book worship, to look upon it, or talk of it, as is too often done, in any such view. The Christian revelation, as we know, was a divine Life and a divine Creed in the Church, long before the production of the New Testament. But what then? Do we make void the honor of the New Testament in this way? God forbid; yea, we establish it. The holy volume is not the origin of Christianity; but it is its heaven-born inspiration and product, bearing upon it the fresh dew of its youth thus through all time. It belongs to the life of the original revelation in a way not possible for any later book, and by it we communicate with the very presence of that life, as we can do nowhere else. This is what gives the book its peculiar sanctity and power, a quality that is felt to extend to its words no less than its thoughts; for all come alike, as it were, from the "holy mount of vision," in which the great things of the Gospel were at first seen and declared.

Church and Scripture thus, we repeat, are alike necessary to the full idea of Christianity; and yet, as neither of them is the origin or principle of Christianity, so neither of them can be of itself a sufficient and entire rule of Christian faith. They are alike the necessary *form* side only of such a rule, which must be complemented or filled out with the proper *matter* of faith from another side to make it what the case requires.

Whence this complement comes, and how it comes, both in the case of the Church and in the case of the Bible, has been already intimated in a general way, but it is now before us for more direct particular consideration.

It comes universally, we may say first of all, through and by the operation of the *Holy Ghost*. It is, in this view, that "witness of the Spirit," the TESTIMONIUM SPIRITUS SANCTI, of which we hear so much in the age of the Reformation, and in the period immediately following, as the ultimate argument of all revealed truth. But just what this means is not at once so clear, and needs here some close attention and careful exposition.

All theories of faith, in which it is not resolved into mere natural reason, involve in them the notion, in some way, that faith is the fruit of God's Spirit, making itself felt in the human spirit. As divine in any sense, faith must come from a divine source, must be the gift of God.

So where the Church, in the Roman or High Episcopalian sense, is made to be the rule of faith. The rule, by its own confession, is in and of itself conclusive at best only for natural human belief; while all real superhuman believing (the only right sense of Christian faith) comes after this outside preparation, and is wholly and entirely God's gift, an "elevation by the grace of God to the supernatural order of life in Christ." True, the Holy Ghost by which this takes place, is regarded here as being so bound to the outward Church, that His agency is made to appear too generally as a sort of magical higher potence tied to the lower so-called natural infallibility of the Church; but it is distinctly recognised, nevertheless, as an altogether separate and independent source of infallible belief (the belief that saves the soul by uniting it through Christ with God), without which that other so-called natural infallibility would be of no account whatever.

And where the Bible, instead of the Church, is taken to be the rule of faith, it is always, as we know (so far as the divine character of the Bible is acknowledged at all), with the same express qualification that the enlightening power of God's Spirit must go along with the written text in some way, to make it in any true sense the medium of infallible divine knowledge. Without this the Protestant rule, no less than the Catholic rule, is found to be only a half rule, and can come at last to nothing more than that natural faith, which, as we have seen, is no evangelical or saving faith at all, but only at best the phantasm of this divine and supernatural grace. Mere natural use of the Scriptures is *not* enough to give men insight into the supernatural sense of the Scriptures; not enough, therefore, to make the Scriptures an infallible rule of faith and practice, in the profoundly foolish way in which this is talked of in certain quarters. There must go along with this the supernatural use

that is possible only through the Holy Ghost, and that is itself faith. "The Spirit breathes upon the word, and brings the truth to sight." So the sacred poet sings, and so all religious sects, pretending to be evangelical, make it a point religiously to believe. Indeed the more unchurchly and sectarian they are, the more loud are they commonly in asserting the distinction of their faith in this God-gifted form.

So far as this goes, therefore, all Protestants who are not infidels, and all Roman Catholics who are not infidels (and there are infidels enough of both sorts), are agreed as to the insufficiency of their respective rules of faith outwardly and formally taken, and acknowledge the necessity of their being complemented by the presence of the truth materially considered in its own proper supernatural form. The material principle of the Holy Ghost at least, must be joined whether with the outward Word or with the outward Church, to make either of them a true and valid "authority in matters of faith."

But now the great question rises upon us: How shall we authenticate the Holy Ghost Himself in this office of complementing what must be otherwise a defective (and at best merely natural) faith in either form? It will not do to say, that there is no occasion for any such question, or, that it answers itself. We are expressly and emphatically told the contrary by the Apostle St. John, where he warns us (1 John iv. 1–3), "not to believe every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they are of God;" and where he gives us at the same time, a simple but grand objective rule for this purpose, which it will come in our way further on to consider. And looking now, moreover, only at the Protestant side of the case, and in the light of actual history, nothing can be more plain as an open palpable fact, than the insecurity of the Bible rule thrown upon the general interpretation of the Holy Ghost, *without a divine voucher for the actual presence of the Holy Ghost;* some evidence that the teaching ascribed to Him is His own teaching, and not something counterfeited simply in His name. Such counterfeiting of the Holy Ghost is a most easy thing, and has been common in the world through all ages. "Spirit, spirit, spirit,"

as Luther says, is the cry of enthusiasts, fanatics, and founders of new sects all the Christian world over. It was so in his time, and it has continued to be so ever since. The Spirit is made to be everywhere the mere slave of sects.

In the case of all such wilful judgment, the illuminating office of the Holy Ghost is taken to be an agency, whereby the human mind is directly acted upon by the Divine Spirit, so as to have from within itself then the power of construing the outward Word of God in its proper heavenly sense. The fact of such special afflatus is supposed to be self-authenticating, as the fact of a man's being awake, is self-authenticating to his waking consciousness. But all resolves itself thus into mere subjective feeling and thought, without any objective support whatever, and in that respect resembles the consciousness of dreams much more than that of broad and open day. There is no real control over faith in this form *from the Word itself.* What is held to be the material principle of faith here (the teaching of the Holy Ghost) flies asunder in truth from its formal principle, and is thus itself dissolved into thin air. The private judgment, that was to be carried beyond itself in this way, is back upon us again in worse form than before; for now it is the human spirit lording it over both Word and Church with the fancied authority of being itself the Divine Spirit.

And so it is that ultimately, sooner or later, such merely subjective exaltation, such direct self-confusion of the human spirit with God's Spirit (without the mediation of the objective Word), is sure to run into sheer rationalism. Beginning in the Spirit, the movement ends in the flesh. First, the historical Christ of the Gospel is lost in the ideal Christ of the soul, the "inward light," which it is held that every man must follow in order to be a true Christian; and then this inward inspiration itself again melts quietly away at last into the common light of reason, and that view of the word in which no serious account is made of the mysteries of religion in any form.

Church history tells us how this false spiritualism wrought mightily in the age of the Reformation toward the overthrow of all true positive and historical Christianity; and how the

Reformers,—Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin and others —set themselves as one man, shoulder to shoulder, against the enemy on this side coming in upon them like a flood; and how both the great sister Confessions, Lutheran and Reformed, stood here without difference, in the beginning on one and the same platform of Conservative Protestantism. In doing so, they did not stop in the idea simply of the Spirit, as being the necessary complement of the Word. How in that way could they have faced effectually, as they did, the "armies of the aliens," the Anabaptists and Socinians, who in their way claimed likewise to have the Spirit? The Protestant principle here went beyond this. It made earnest with the idea of the Word in its supernatural character, as being the necessary complement also of the Spirit. *How* this was done remains now to be shown.

IV. Union of Faith and the Word by the Spirit.

The testimony of the Holy Ghost, of which so much account was made by the Reformers in the sixteenth century as the sure and sufficient authentication of the Word of God, over against the mere outward authority of the Romanists on the one side, and the mere private inspiration of the new "Heavenly Prophets" on the other side, was not an unbound magical influence touching the spirits of men in an abrupt and direct way. It was held to be organically joined to the presence of the Word itself, not just to the outward Bible, but to the objective supernatural revelation that looks forth upon us everywhere through the Bible; and was considered to be of force, therefore, only as it served to bring the minds of those who came under its power, into felt actual contact with this revelation, in its own heavenly form. The testimony in this view was looked upon as being not immediate but mediate. It was held to be conditioned by the intervention of a real supernatural activity on the part of the human soul itself taking hold of the supernatural verity which could only thus be made sure to its apprehension. The power to do this must be itself, in the nature of the case, the gift of God, the product of the Holy Ghost; but it was to be regarded as none the less for that rea-

son, the necessary organ and medium through which the Holy Ghost bears witness to the truth; in which character, then, it here challenges our attention at once as being itself in form that very witnessing of the Divine Spirit, to the consideration of which we have now come as the deepest authentication of God's word to the human spirit.

The power or organ through which the Holy Ghost thus works, all can see at once, is *Faith.* Not natural human faith, of course; not such faith as is poised primarily and simply on the logically accredited authority of the Church, or on the supposed infallible inspiration of the Bible. Orthodox Romanists and orthodox Presbyterians, as we have seen, agree in looking upon such natural belief as something which, of itself, never touches really the supernatural verities with which the Christion salvation is concerned. All this, therefore, is not faith at all, either in the true evangelical or in the true ecclesiastical sense of the term; is not the power to which our attention is here directed; the power, which is in itself the evidential demonstration, as St. Paul tells us, of the eternal and the unseen, which is wrought in the soul for this purpose by the Holy Ghost, and which thus shares with the Holy Ghost the high office of verifying and attesting the truth of Christianity in the world.

Faith, in the high sense here spoken of, cannot be separated from the supernatural realities with which it has to do; it depends on them for its own existence; just as vision in the natural world depends for its existence, as actual seeing, on the visible things it sees. Sunder faith notionally from its invisible objects, and it ceases to be faith. The objects, too, although they do not owe their own existence to faith, can have no reality for our apprehension, except through its means; as light is no reality for the eyes of the blind. Faith is the only organ by which the invisible and eternal is made to be actual (and not simply notional) for us in our present state; the only real bridge across the chasm that divides time from eternity, the natural from the supernatural; the only medium of possible living conjunction, therefore, between the realities of religion in their

own higher spiritual world, and the souls of men in the world of sense and flesh. It is itself in such view the very form, in which God's revelations take upon them substance and felt presence for the human spirit. It is the subjective and objective sides of divine revelation mysteriously blended into one. Faith, as the act of the believer, is subjective; but drawing, as it does, its whole existence and force at the same time from the supernatural realities that call it into exercise, it has part also in their objectivity, and is at once thus the certification of their truth as well as of its own.

Altogether, there is a necessary fundamental correspondence between divine faith and the mysteries of revelation. They are two sides of one fact, two factors in one process. They seek and demand each other. Revelation is for faith; and faith is for revelation. They are correlative ideas, and mutually complemental terms.

So it is with the relation which holds between the facts and truths of divine revelation generally and divine faith. But these facts and truths are not so many different revelations on the part of God, joined together in a loosely outward way. They form together a single inwardly connected and organic whole. They are with God—to whom our whole time-existence is no more than a point—one grand act of self-manifestation, starting in the first promise after the Fall, and coming to its end at last in Christ. In Him we behold the alpha and omega of the universal movement, and are brought also to understand its sense. In the light of His presence, all previous revelations are seen to have been partial and relative only (Heb. 1: 1–4), like the different stages of the morning dawn that herald the approach of day; while He is the full-orbed sun of righteousness itself rising upon the nations, with healing in His beams. At the same time, He is Himself the one glorious centre and fountain also of all that is comprised in His coming into the world. His offices, doctrines, works; His sufferings, death, resurrection and glorification; in one word, the totality of the New Testament dispensation, all that we call Christianity, and the universal economy of the Christian Church, out to the end

of time, and over into eternity—all flow forth from His person and have their perennial force in the power of His indestructible Life. The idea of revelation can go no further. God can come no nearer to man. "He that hath seen Me," we hear Him say to His disciples, "*hath seen the Father.*"

And answerably to this it is now that faith also, the God-awakened capacity in man to perceive and know the things that are freely given to men of God, comes to have its perfect work ultimately only in the Christian form, and here only as it is found to centre upon Christ Himself, the actual centre of the Christian system. Here especially the true nature and power of faith come fully into view, in its character of a supernatural principle which transcends all lower forms of evidence, and sees its object at once in the evidence of its own supernatural light.

Christ as the absolute truth, to be seen and known at all, must be seen and known in this self-evidencing and self-authenticating way. He cannot be known as a conclusion simply from any sort of evidence beyond Himself; for that would imply dependence on other truth deeper than Himself in the world; whereas, He is deeper than all truth besides, and all other truth as related to Him is secondary only and dependent. For, as St. Paul tells us, "He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." He is the Divine Logos, the beginning and the end of all things, clothed in the form of humanity, the eternal idea of the world carried out to its full actualization in time. He is "the way, the truth, and the life." He is "the light of the world," whom if men follow, they shall not walk in darkness. He "hath life in Himself." He is the "resurrection and the life." He is the Son of God, commensurate in mind and will with the Father. He is the "brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person."

For truth in such form, it is plain, there can be but one ultimate argument or demonstration, namely, that which flows forth directly from the presence of the truth itself; and the only organ for its apprehension is Christian faith, wrought in the soul for the purpose by the power of the Holy Ghost.

There is a profound reason for such faith, at the same time,

in the constitutional relation of the human soul itself to Christ, since it is only through Him that any soul can ever attain to a feeling of true rest in God. The soul needs Him for the completion of its own being, especially in the way of deliverance from sin. And thus it is that the faith which is God's gift, is as it were born also from the glorious object toward which it is directed. It comes from looking to Christ, and is the result of a divine drawing with which it is met from His person. It is the flowing together of two forms of existence, that seek each other and cannot be held apart. In its very nature, in this way, faith is the free spontaneous movement of the human spirit, by which it goes forth from itself and unites itself with Christ, in acts of apprehension answering to what He is for its own inmost needs. It is thus more than theory or knowledge; it involves the will and the affections; it carries in it the character of self-surrendering, loving trust, and is at once, in and of itself, the consciousness of a new life, the sense, as far as it goes, of a changed existence over against God and the world.

Where the first profound need of the soul is the removal of sin, such faith of course must involve in it repentance, and take its beginning as it were from the idea of the atonement. But we must not think of it, even in that view, as starting with the atonement and the forgiveness of sin abstractly or separately considered. The atonement is no doctrinal abstraction. It has its reality only and wholly in Christ; and to lay hold of it at all, justifying faith, as it is called, must lay hold of it by an act of apprehension that terminates immediately and first of all on the person of Christ Himself.

Faith in the forgiveness of sins, Dr. Dorner tells us, as it was held by Luther, and is finely described especially in his *Freedom of a Christian Man*, is not faith simply in an impersonal merit of Christ, but trustful surrendry to Christ as the living atoner. In Him faith embraces the God-given personal atonement; and is thus joined with the whole Christ, so as to have part at the same time in all His benefits. "It is not immediately a theoretic truth, a doctrine, as for example the inspiration of the Scriptures, that faith makes sure of, nor yet

any inward change brought to pass by itself, nor finally any new *life-relation on our side to God;* on the contrary, it is immediately the perception of being known and loved of God, the assurance of a new *life-relation on God's side to us*, the sense of being personally redeemed through the love of God, directed toward us personally in Christ" (Gesch. d. prot. Theol. p. 221, 223).

What is true of the atonement as thus related to the person of Christ, is in the nature of the case no less true necessarily of all else belonging to the world of Christian faith. That world is not made up, as many seem to think, of outwardly separate verities and facts, having severally more or less their own separate evidence, and capable of standing to some extent by themselves. It is a world derived entirely from Christ, in which all things owe to Him continually their entire truth and being. As objects of faith then, they can be rightly apprehended only under this and no other view. Faith must mirror the objective world of grace as it is, if it is to be at all true faith. Whatever it grasps as Christian supernatural faith, be it promise or doctrine, history or outward institution, it must do it as being explicitly or implicitly faith in the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

Such is the relation in which all Christian Evidences, as they are called, stand to Christ. Miracles and Prophecies, for example, had no power, during His ministry on earth, to prove what He was in an outside way. The proof they had in them for any such purpose lay not in themselves separately taken, but only in what they were as the fitting expression of His own inward glory (John ii. 11). In that view they could not be wanting to His presence, the deepest sense and power as He was of the world's life. His presence without them, as thus world central, would not have been cosmically and historically real, but must have been phantasmagorical only and ideal. In this way, however, they are seen to depend on Him altogether for their own force. They are the effluent, but in no sense the influent evidence of His truth. They belong peripherally to the revelation of which He, and He alone, is the one infinitely glo-

rious centre, and they have no light in them really, except as rays shot forth from its brilliant effulgence.

And just so it is again also with the relation of the Church and the Bible to Christ, which is found to be with so many, as we have seen, a source of bewildering confusion. Neither of them can by itself substantiate Christ; and it can only be monstrous to put either of them into the place of Christ, by pretending to make it the corner-stone of Christian truth (Eph. ii. 20) or the first object of Christian faith. Church and Bible are not, either separately or together, the fountain of revelation; they are only streams from that fountain, existing in a higher and different form. The fountain in its ultimate wholeness is Christ; "God hath spoken to us by His Son." In Him is the fullness of the Godhead bodily. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." Yet Church and Bible are not by any means, for this reason, shorn of their significance in the Christian system. It is only, indeed, by falling thus into right secondary relation to Christ, that they come at all to their true divine sense and honor. Then they appear as necessary parts of the Christian revelation, and become in that view, like miracles and prophecies, necessary objects of Christian faith. They are not accidental to Christianity; they belong to its inmost constitution. Without them, Christianity could not be historical, in the double sense of flowing onward continuously in time and yet not breaking away from what its own life was in the beginning; and ceasing to be historical, it must at the same time cease also to be real. Both are in this way indispensable modes and forms of manifestation for the truth that is in Christ, but they are so only as this truth shines in them, and through them, so that they are made luminous with its celestial presence.

And so far now as Christian faith is the gift of God, and the work of the Holy Ghost, it must conform throughout also to what is thus found to be the objective constitution of the Christian revelation; starting with the person of Christ Himself first of all, and reaching out from Him as a centre, then, to all peri-

pheral and dependent truths in the order of their relation to His presence. This is the simple criterion furnished us by St. John, for deciding the true character of all pretensions to spiritual illumination and power (1 John iv. 1–3). Only such faith as confesses the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh, seeing in that mystery the principle, and potentially the all in all of the Christian salvation, is of God. The Spirit who works faith in men, is the Spirit of Christ. How then should He not be bound by the law of Christ's life? How should He not be in full harmony with Himself as He is present in the Word and in the Church? "He shall glorify Me," Christ says. "He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you." That is His office; and that is the signature of His work. "Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."

With this agrees in full the representation we have in the New Testament of what faith is practically, as the principle of righteousness and the power of God unto salvation. The work of God required of men gathers itself up fundamentally into this, that they "*believe on Him whom He hath sent*" (John vi. 29). This is in a profound sense the whole Gospel. This is eternal life; to know God *in the mission or sending of His Son* (John v. 24, xvii. 2, 3). So in that grand Apostolic confession, Matth. xvi. 16, where we meet first of all the living and vivific idea of the Apostles' Creed, and which our Lord Himself declares to have been not of human but of supernatural revelation. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God!" There objectively Christianity has its basis and beginning; and there subjectively all true Christian faith, the work of God's Spirit in the soul of man, also begins. One is for the other; and the meeting of the two in the one and the same life, is the Rock on which the Church is built beyond all the power of hell to overthrow or destroy.

And this is precisely the meaning of the Apostles' Creed throughout. Objectively, it is the economy of the Christian salvation in its leading fundamental facts, all centering in Christ, and all growing forth from Christ with inward necessity, in the order in which they are there presented. Subjectively, it is

the answer of the soul to these facts, under the same view of their inward and necessary derivation from Christ by the power of divine faith, a power that is called forth in the soul for the purpose by the Holy Ghost.

It is just this direct relation here of divine faith to divine revelation centering in Christ, that makes such faith in a most important sense an independent witness of the truth of revelation; so that we have in it a new testimony to this truth added to the outward testimony of Scripture and the Church, namely, the testimony of the Holy Ghost drawn immediately from the supernatural matter of the Christian revelation itself. Scripture and the Church serve to bring Christ into view in His historical form; but they cannot originate the faith that sees in Him the "Son of the Living God;" this can come only from the light of His own presence through the power of the Holy Ghost. Such faith is then in itself the assurance of the truth of its object, as well as of its own truth. It says to Scripture and the Church: "Now I believe, not because of your saying; for I have heard and seen for myself, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world!" And thus it is that it becomes the key of the Spirit to the outward Word, and the light that makes it radiant with its true interior sense; while it is conditioned and ruled by the same Word in this illuminated form, nevertheless, as the medium through which the things of the Spirit are brought into view.

This is that TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY GHOST, of which, as we have said, so much account was made in the age of the Reformation, as the necessary complement of the Word of God taken for authority in matters of faith, over against the Roman rule of the outward Church. All the Reformers urge it; and we find it distinctly introduced, more or less, into the early Protestant Confessions.* The argument regards, primarily, of

* Nowhere more succinctly and compactly than in the latest of them, the Westminster Confession of 1647. "We may be moved and induced," it is there said, "by the testimony of the Church to a high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all

course, the divine matter of the Word; but with this it refers itself rightly also to the Word in its outward written form; since the outward form by its means is lighted up now with what has been all along its true material sense. The Scriptures, through this inward light, are felt to be divine, independently of any particular theory of their inspiration or canonical authority; independently, we may say, of all scientific criticism or exegesis. And this divinity belongs to their language, no less than to their inward thought and spirit; for all is redolent together of the first fresh life of the divine revelation from which they spring, and of which they are a constantly abiding portion and part.

"Did faith in the divinity of the Scriptures," says Twesten, "rest on anything other than their directly self-announcing divinity itself, it might be asked if this other must not just for that reason stand higher than the faith derived from it. Hence the objections of Roman Catholic as well as Rationalistic opposers of the system. If, say the first, you receive the Scriptures on the authority of the Church, how can you then afterwards use them against the Church? If, say the latter, you hold the Scriptures for divine on grounds of reason, how can you then refuse to acknowledge reason as the highest judge in matters of faith? To this much else might be said in reply; but our main answer runs thus: It is *not* on the authority of the Church, *nor* yet on any principles of reason, that faith in the Scriptures ultimately rests; it is on the power of the Christian life itself, wrought by God through His word, and carrying with it the immediate assurance of His own truth."

It is with the written word in this respect, as it was in the beginning with the word preached by Christ and His Apostles —the original living form of what the written word is for us

---

glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts."

now, so far as the New Testament is concerned. The preaching of St. Paul among the Corinthians, he himself tells us (1 Cor. ii. 1–5), as elsewhere also, was not with the persuasion of man's wisdom, but with the demonstration of the Spirit, and as such was effectual then only for divine faith, standing likewise "in the power of God." And so he says to the Thessalonians: "For this cause thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received is not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which *effectually worketh also in you that believe*" (1 Thess. ii. 13). How should it be otherwise? How else should the light of God in the word be intelligible, except through the light of God in the soul? And that light in the soul is supernatural faith, the gift and work of the Holy Ghost. He that is of God in this way, heareth God's words; others hear them not, understand them not, receive them not (even though spoken to them by the Son of God Himself), *just because they are not of God* (John viii. 47).

In the terse expression of Zwingli: "*constat verbo nusquam fidem haberi, quam ubi pater traxit, spiritus monuit, unctio docuit.*"

ART. III.—THE TRUE IDEA OF THE CHRISTIAN RITUAL.

BY REV. MOSES KIEFFER, D.D., GREENCASTLE, PA.

IN the present divided state of the Church we cannot expect of course that her Ritual will answer fully to her own idea. As there is *One* Lord, *One* faith and *one* baptism: as the holy catholic Church is *one*, it is but natural to suppose that her prescribed forms of worship should be uniform. As the grand ceremonial of the Old Testament Temple was a true expression of its own divine idea, why may we not expect that the ceremonial of the New Testament Church, of which the Old is the type, should also be the true and proper expression of its devotional spirit and life? If in the former the outward form could not be separated from its inward contents, why should such divorce be demanded in the latter?

We are told, in reply, that the kingdom of God does not come by observation. Under the Christian dispensation, men are to worship God, who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth. Here all the types and shadows of the Old Testament dispensation have come to their fulfilment in the sphere of the Spirit. Or, as said by the philosopher Jacobi, in his work on Divine things: "To the true religion no outward form can be ascribed, as the sole and necesssary shape of its substance, on the contrary, the utter absence of all forms is characteristic of its very essence. As the glory of God lay hidden in Christ, so it lies hidden in every man."

To this view of Christianity, not merely the Pietists, the Puritans and Separatists generally, will give their hearty assent; but many who do not wish to be considered unchurchly and unsacramental also favor it by declaiming continually in an indiscriminate way against Ritualism. "The Roman Catholic Church is ritualistic." "The High Church Episcopalians are ritualistic."

"so also that portion of the Lutheran Church that wears the gown and uses the wafer." And many a pious soul in our communion is praying to-day that our Reformed Church may never become ritualistic, but always remain what it was in the beginning namely, "Reformed." It is not the design of this article by any means to apologize for a Ritual which "the law of life in Christ Jesus does not demand, or that does not stand legitimately in the 'nature of divine things.'" Nor is it the intention to administer a rebuke to the followers of Spener, (the father of the Pietists,) of Robert Brown [1580] and of John Robinson, "who preached that according to apostolic example every congregation should be an independent Church, and that every man is justified in worshiping God according to his own conscience." [Dr. Hase, Ch. Hist. Page 423].

The *fundamental* question before us is whether Christianity itself develops the ritualistic principle, or whether it is something foreign to its true spirit. In other words, is the idea of ritual involved necessarily in the true idea of Christian worship? The term "Ritual" is to be taken of course in its true etymological sense, as implying a religious rite (ritus) or ceremony, and not in the sense that may be attached to it by bleareyed prejudice. Usually the ritualistic Churches are looked upon as having a certain form of godliness without its power. They are cold and formal, "having a name to live while they are dead." The Ritual is regarded as the very cause of the spiritual declension and death. Hence the "hue and-cry" against all Ritual and ritualistic tendencies. A singular way indeed of looking at things, it must be confessed. In a neighboring dwelling, for example, there lives a family of unusual culture. The whole order of life there is different from what it is in my own plain, simple and primitive-like home. There music and the sense of the beautiful have been cultivated in the highest degree. There are the best specimens of the fine arts in every department of the large mansion. The laws of refined society are observed by all the members of the family in their intercourse with one another, and especially with reference to invited guests. In a word there is ceremony there, which to me

may seem silly and foolish even, or at least meaningless. But for the family itself it may have the highest and deepest significance and the most ennobling effects. It does not become *me* therefore to sit in judgment upon the ceremony of my neighbor's family. But what would the enlightened public opinion of this nineteenth century say of me if, upon being told that all the members of this cultivated family had suddenly departed this life, I would give it as my deliberate judgment that their death was caused by their refinement and their strict observance of the family ceremonial! suppose even that public opinion would coincide with my judgment in this case, would that prove its correctness? It might indeed if family culture were a cause of death at all, and the only cause.

Let it be conceded then, as it really is by pious Churchmen of every name, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, that there has been spiritual declension, and even great unfaithfulness and corruption in the ritualistic Churches at different times and in different places. No one is more ready to make such concessions than the pious and learned Mœhler, whose devotion to the "Mother Church" will not be doubted. In speaking of the occasion for the Reformation of the sixteenth century he says: "Doubtless examples enough can be alleged of priests, bishops and popes, who, in the most unconscionable and unjustifiable manner, have failed to discharge their duty, when it was quite in their power to bring about a reform of morals; or who, by their own scandalous conduct and lives, have extinguished the still glimmering torch which they ought to have kindled. Hell hath swallowed them up. Avowals of this kind Catholics must not shrink from, and never have shrunk from; it would be even idle to attempt to elude them, for Protestants themselves furnish an irrefragable proof of the state of manifold neglect into which the people had fallen during the fifteenth century. Never would a system of doctrine like theirs have sprung up, still less have obtained such wide diffusion, had individual teachers and priests been faithful to the duties of their calling. Truly the ignorance could not have been slight, on which a system of faith, like that of the Reformers, was imposed as

worthy of acceptance: and thus Protestants may learn to estimate the magnitude of the evil, which then oppressed the Church, by the magnitude of the errors into which they themselves have fallen. This is the point at which Catholics and Protestants will, in great multitudes, one day meet and stretch a friendly hand one to the other. Both conscious of guilt, must exclaim, "We all have erred, it is the Church only which cannot err; we all have sinned—the Church only is spotless on earth." This open confession of mutual guilt will be followed by the festival of reconciliation. (Mœhler's Symbolism, P. 349.) Here of course the eye is resting upon the Church as a divine objective institution of the means of grace, as distinct from the individuality of her membership and priesthood, in which Christ is always present and against which consequently the gates of hell cannot prevail. If then, to use the language quoted, corrupted priests and people of any given period of the Church's history "have been swallowed up of hell," is the cause of their perdition to be found in the objective means of grace —the sacraments, the services—the Ritual? Only in the sense that these means of grace have been to those who believe not a savor of death unto death. Bleared indeed is the eye which sees in the Ritual as such the cause of spiritual declension. Take, on the other hand, the Jacobian view as the correct one, namely, that the essential characteristic of the true religion is, "that no form can be ascribed to it." "It is hidden in human nature as the glory of God lay hidden in His only begotten Son."

We have become quite familiar with the idea of the only true and absolute religion as it resolves itself into that of life. "God is the living God." "The life of God is in His Son," and "Christ is the life of His people." Dr. Vinet resolves the idea of Christianity into that of the Word. "In the beginning was the word, and the word was God." Christ is God's Word spoken to man, and its effect upon man is his response to God. According to either of these conceptions Christianity takes to itself form and shape. All life is organic, it develops in the form of body: the word is also a form; it is the form of its own idea. The absolute Word spoken to man, and through

man to the praise of God, is the highest form and in the highest degree formative.

But the spiritualistic conception referred to denies to Christianity all form. God's revelation to man is in its very nature an internal revelation in the spirit. All saving grace is communicated to the human soul *immediately*. And each soul in virtue of such communication takes its proper attitude before the great Jehovah. The heart is the temple in which the Holy Ghost dwells. The pure and acceptable worship is internal in the spirit. All hearts which have the Spirit of God thus dwelling in them are in conscious communion with God. He is the common Father of all. The kingdom of God is within them, and they are in it. In this union and communion they are the Church; the true invisible Church. So purely and intensely spiritual, however, as to be without form. "No form whatever can be ascribed to it." Of this the grand ceremonial of the Old Testament economy may have been the type and shadow, but all shadow has now disappeared in the clear bright effulgence of spiritual day. The Christian period may have its ecclesiastical establishment; its Church edifices, with their altars, pulpits, chancels, priests, ministers, rites, ceremonies, ordinances and forms of worship; and this it may call the Church—"the visible Church;" but all this is merely human; it is at best nothing but the continuation of Judaism. It is a grand form without contents—a mere shadow without substance. You may be a devout and faithful member of the outward, "visible" Church and not be a member at all of the true, "invisible" Church. The visibility of the one and the invisibility of the other, places them as far apart as the heavens are above the earth.

With this idea of the "invisible Church" it was very common for the Reformers (greatly to the injury of the Protestant cause) to oppose the Church of Rome. Thus Luther in his work "On the Papacy" [Vol. I. p. 266] says: "As we pray in faith, I believe in a Holy Ghost, in a communion of saints. This means the community or congregation, of all those who live in the right faith, hope and charity; thus the essence, life

and nature of Christendom consists not in bodily assemblage, but in the assemblage of hearts in one faith."—"Furthermore, because communion with the visible constitutes no communion with the invisible, and because many non-Christians are found in the visible Church, so no visible Church is at all necessary."

Thus the common distinction made by both Lutheran and Reformed divines between the visible and invisible Church was forced too often into an actual separation. And this, as said, greatly to the detriment of our common Protestant cause. When we read language like the above, used by eminent men who have written more than a man can read in an ordinary life-time, we cannot help but exclaim: "O that they had thought more and written less!" Poor and weak indeed is that argument whose force can be turned against itself. The Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches after all took form and shape. They have their histories, and their ecclesiasticism. And again and again is their own idea of the invisible Church used against themselves by the Pietists, the Anabaptists, the Puritans and the swarms of minor sects, whilst the Catholic polemic looks upon the whole scene and exclaims: "Behold how the Protestant error has gone to seed!"

That to which we would here turn the attention is the fact that all Protestant denominations and sects, however earnestly they may advocate the doctrine of an invisible Church and "spiritual" piety, have nevertheless their "*Outwardism*," by which they can be distinguished the one from the other, and by which all are distinguished from the Church of Rome. The great Protest itself of the Protestant world against Roman Catholic error, whether it be positive or negative, is "in forma." *All* Protestant worship, as well as Roman Catholic, has its forms, either prescribed or pre-determined by custom. This is true of the Puritan, yea of the veriest Quaker as well as of the High Church Episcopalian. Their peculiar forms of faith and doctrine, of government, and worship are well known. When new sects come out of older ones they may throw off the old form of life, and imagine that they are now

the true invisible Church, or at least that they have made the nearest approach to the ideal of the true religion "to which no form can be ascribed," yet in making this change, whether they are conscious of it or not, they only exchange one form of religious life for another. It may be for the better. This is not the question. Which one of the two hundred and forty-two denominations and sects that bear the Christian name, has the form of existence that is most acceptable in the sight of God, we would not determine. Ask the general question, which was so often put to the Reformers: "Where is the true invisible Church?" All collectively and singly will give the response: "It is where we are." This is the answer from all Protestant Churches. God grant that it may be correct. The "nota" of the true Church we are told are the preaching of the Gospel in its purity and the proper administration of the Sacraments. Wherever this is the case there is the Church. Each and every denomination says of itself: "We have the pure Gospel and we have the Sacraments instituted by our Lord! therefore we are the Church." Even the Quaker claims to have them internally in the spirit, of which he gives us the outward sign in his peculiar dress and walk, and especially in his peculiar "*Quaking.*"

The oft-repeated, and almost continuous effort to actualize the true religion by throwing off all form, which nevertheless results *invariably* only in the change of form, is strong evidence, to say the least, that the whole spiritualistic conception of the Christian religion is a one-sidedness, and, when carried out to its ultimate consequence, terminates in infidelity: it is at best a gnostic fancy, or dream. In view of this appalling fact it becomes every sincere inquirer after the truth to ask the question whether the Protestant Church, or (still better) Christianity in the form of Protestantism is properly represented by those who hold and teach that the true religion is that "to which no form can be ascribed." Is the Church what some of the Reformers have made it in this respect, and what they conceived it to be? Or is it an objective mystery by which they were only apprehended in part? Do men make

history or are men made by history? Is their subjective view of a mystery that which gives it reality, or is the real objective mystery that which does and should control and determine the subjective view? If what the Reformers even (not to name the modern would-be Reformers) think and say in regard to the Holy Catholic Church is that precisely which we must believe when we profess our faith (in this article), then our common Protestant cause is but the baseless fabric of a subjective vision. It must then indeed come to naught, because it is not of God. Such structure we say has no foundation, no objective ground to rest upon. God is not in it. There may be service, a Ritual in such edifice (it cannot be without this as we have seen); but just here the forms are empty and meaningless. Let it not be forgotten that there may be a subjective formality, as well as an objective. Of the latter it may be said, it is true, "the letter killeth, it is the spirit that quickeneth;" but of the former it can be just as truly said, "*it is death per se.*" The one is Ebionism, and the other Gnosticism. Both are heresies. Both deny that the Son of God has come in the flesh.

What shall we say then? Is Protestantism as such, which has favored too much the spiritualistic, or subjective, one-sidedness, a heresy? Let such thought be far from us. We are happy in the belief that it is infinitely more real and glorious than it appears to be in the persons of many of its representatives.

The Catholic complains when we hold his Church responsible for the scandals of its priests and members. "The Church alone is spotless on earth," he tells us. The priesthood and membership then are not apostles; they are not the Church. "Our religion," said a Catholic to me personally, "is infinitely better than we are." His religion is objective! it is one thing, and his subjectivity is another thing altogether. The distance between them is as great as that between the invisible and visible Church of the spiritualistic Protestant. We claim from the Catholic what he claims from us, namely, honesty and fairness in regard to this matter. If Christianity as it is embodied

in the form of his Church is not to be judged by the character of its ministers and laity, then we ask that it be not judged as it unfolds itself in the form of the Protestant Church, by the one-sided views of theologians, the fanaticism of sects, and the many instances of infidelity and immorality. In either case the precept is of force! "Judge not, lest ye be judged."

We hold that the Protestant Church is the *historical continuation* of the *One* Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. If it be a mere subjectivity, be it never so zealous and pious, it cannot, in the nature of the case, authenticate itself as the only true religion, just as little as a one-sided objectivity has this power.

The Romanists who claim this power for their one-sided objectivity have fallen away from the original faith: and the Protestants who claim it for their one-sided subjectivity are involved in the condemnation of a similar apotasy. The whole ritualistic controversy so far between the two contending parties, is to a great extent a one-sidedness against a one-sidedness. Both are in fault, both are wrong. It is not the war of the spirit against the flesh. Nor is it a war between Protestantism rightly understood, and Catholicism. True Protestantism is but the true Christian religion itself protesting against that which is not Christian. It is Catholic, and protests against that which is not Catholic. Its misfortune is that every form of spiritualistic error bears its name. And from the other side the true Catholic cause is made to suffer in consequence of the one-sided objectivity having been baptized in its holy name. In other words, the two errors have both taken the Christian name, and in that holy name they wage their unholy warfare. It is a war between error and error nevertheless. If it were a contest indeed between the spirit of true Christian piety and a dead formality, how fervently we would pray for the success of the former against the latter. But as said, it is a pseudo-spirit against a pseudo-spirit, a false religious life against a false life, and consequently a false ceremonial against a false ceremonial. Let conquer which will, it is not a Christian conquest. Yet we cannot be indifferent in regard to the result; because should spiritualism come to reign supreme amongst men it will only

be a reign of infidelity to be overcome by the Christian faith; and should the other side gain the ascendency, the false trust in the outward, and the devotion to it as to an idol must also be conquered by the same power. Here we cordially unite with the learned author quoted in the expression of the hope that Catholics and Protestants will in great multitudes, at no distant day, meet, and extend a friendly hand the one to the other, in the mutual acknowledgment of error and sin.

But there must be a *place* of meeting. There must be a *place* for the celebration of the festival of reunion. There must be a ground sufficiently broad and deep for all to stand upon, and there must be a bond of love sufficiently strong to unite and hold together all the once scattered and bleeding members of Christ's mystical body. Where are these to be found? In Asia Minor? In Greece? In Rome? In Germania? No national soil is sufficiently broad for this foundation. And no national Church, however near it may have come, in the development of its past life, to the true idea of the absolute religion, has sufficient length and breadth to become the banqueting-house of universal Christian love. The Latin Church cannot become the German Church so as to lose its identity, nor can the German, in such sense, flow back into the Latin. This idea that certain Churches have, that they are THE Church, is just about as sensible as the conceit that a nation might have, that it is the whole world. The idea of humanity is broader and deeper than that of nationality; it includes all nations. So precisely here: the true idea of the Catholic Church is as broad and as deep as humanity. The Church of Rome may be in the Catholic Church, we do not deny to it the Christian name, but it is not *the* Catholic Church. So the Church of England may be in the Catholic Church, whether she can succeed in tracing her connection with the primitive apostles or not; but she is not THE Church. The same can be said of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches; they are IN the Church; but they are not THE Church, and to their honor be it said, they have not set up this claim. The broad and deep ground, then, upon which the unity of the Church can be actualized, is its Catholicity. When

we believe in *one* Church, this must needs be the Catholic Church, whose life is to permeate and sanctify the entire body of humanity, in all the forms of its existence. Under this view, it is said by the Apostle, to be "the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." To this apostolic idea of Catholicity, we must strictly adhere, in order to understand the question under consideration. A one-sided objectivity may develop a ritual that answers to its idea, but, as we have seen, it does not answer to the true idea of the Christian cultus. And the one-sided subjectivity developing its ritual in spite of itself, is no less a distortion and deformity. Yet the abnormal presupposes the normal. Where there is no law, there is no sin; for sin is the transgression of the law. Where there is no truth, there is no error; because error is the truth perverted. The strong tendencies to a one-sided objectivity on the one hand, and a one-sided subjectivity on the other, which the history of the Church has developed, presuppose a normal relation of both. The *abstract* conception of the invisible Church, is erroneous; it is contrary to analogy, and to God's Holy Word. You may predicate invisibility of the Catholic Church, and so also you may predicate of it visibility; but there are not two Churches, the one having form and the other having no form. Christ has not two bodies, the one hidden and unseen, and the other outward and visible. No such dualistic idea as this was conveyed by the great Teacher, when He unfolded the laws of God's kingdom in parables; and no such thought was entertained by the inspired Apostle, when he declared the Church to be the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. The idea of the Apostle is concrete, as well as general. Just as the true idea of humanity is that of a concrete generality, so the true idea of Christianity, or of the *one* Catholic Church, is a concrete generality. Individual human life is what it is, just because it stands in concrete union and communion with the general life of the race, whilst at the same time the general life exists, and develops itself, in the form of nationality and individuality. The microcosm is in the macrocosm. Of the former, you may say it is invisible, it has

its interior side as well as exterior; but who would separate them into two little worlds, as though the soul were one "concretum," and the body another "concretum?" Of the great world we may predicate the same; it has its inner life, and also its outward visible form; but no one would say there are two human worlds, the one invisible, and the other visible. The great world, in its relation to the individual, is objective; its grand form is seen, its presence is felt, its voice is heard. And the individual, in relation to the great world of humanity is subjective. It is for him a great apprehending power, which determines his whole life in all the stages of its development. It is the kingdom into which he has been born, and he is *subject* to its laws, he is under its authority, and from these there is no escape. He is in the world, and the world is in him. He is in it as the members are in the body, and it is in him as the life of the body pervades the members.

Here we see plainly enough that the ideas of the objective and subjective flow together, they become one. They are distinct, yet the distinction between them holds in their unity.

So, also, when we extend our view to the whole creation. Here, too, we have the same distinction. Angels and men are included in the sphere of subjective being, and all else is objective; yet the creation is *one*. In relation to man, nature is a realm, a kingdom, in which he was destined to rule; yet it is the conditioning power of his whole life. The relation is organic, therefore. He is in nature, and nature is in him. It is for him a visible sign and seal of an invisible presence. [Heb. xi. 2.]

Here is the great mystery which philosophy cannot fathom, namely, the relation of the spiritual to that which is not spiritual, the soul to the body, the inward to the outward, and how the one acts upon the other, whilst at the same time it is conditioned by it, no one can explain.

All this is true, also, of the new creation in Christ Jesus, the Church. Here, too, there is a great world and a little world, the one in the other. In its relation to the individual Christian, the Church is objective, its history extending through ages, always seen, always felt, and its voice always heard. Christ

Himself is the true objectivity, in the form of His body. We may say of Him, truly He is invisible; His life as it pervades His mystical body, is an inner life. This we may say, also, of the proto-adamic life. Personally, the first Adam is removed from the world of sense, yet his life is the life of the body of humanity. So, here, precisely. Christ, the second Adam, is the inner life of humanity, as taken up in His body, the Church; yet in this very form it becomes outward, visible, and real. It is the divine objective power, by which the proto-adamite is apprehended and made a deutero-adamite, by which he is regenerated, sanctified, and glorified.

Under this view, the Church is older than the collective body of believers. The New Jerusalem is from above. The kingdom of God is objectively present, it is at hand; it must be present before a man can be born into it by water and the Spirit. Hence, on the very birthday of Christianity (the day of Pentecost), the thousands who repented and were baptized for the remission of their sins, were ADDED to the Church. They were born into the kingdom of God, which was at hand. We do not read of their meeting and organizing the congregation, by appointing a President, adopting a constitution, and agreeing upon an order of worship. How ridiculous such thought, when compared with the inspired record of the grand fact. The law of the kingdom into which they are born is extant; its requirements, its precepts, are written, they are *prescribed.* The *whole order* of Christian life and worship is predetermined. The very form of the Christian baptism has been given: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The baptismal grace is continued in the form of the communion, also prescribed by the Lord Himself, the same night in which He was betrayed. In their relation to this whole objective mystery, revealed from heaven, individual Christians are subjective; they are apprehended by a power that is above and beyond themselves. Grace reigns in them and over them. They are its subjects; they are subjects in a real objective kingdom.

Here, also, any one can see that true Christian subjectivity holds only in its concrete union with the objective. The state-

ment that the outward, the visible Church, is not necessary to subjective or personal piety, is therefore erroneous. The inference to this effect, from the fact that there are many non-Christians in the visible church, is false. Does the fact that there are bad children in the family, and bad citizens in the State, prove that the family relation is not necessary, and that the State is not a power ordained of God? Would Christ have ordained the means of grace, the holy ministry, the sacraments, if they were not necessary? Would He have said to Peter: "Upon this rock I will build my Church," if there is to be no real historical church, no *real* communion of saints? If Christ had redeemed merely the spirits of men, and not also their bodies; if saving grace did not reach as far as sin and the curse; if the salvation wrought out for the children of men were not complete, then we might concede that the new creation in Christ Jesus is without its form. But if humanity be redeemed in the totality of its being, then the religion of redemption must be outward as well as inward, because the body of humanity has its outward as well as its inward side. In other words, its subjectivity holds in its concrete union with the objective.

The real objective presence of the Church being acknowledged, its power felt, and its form seen, the ritualistic principle must necessarily be admitted. For the Christian ritual is nothing more nor less than the proper and true observance of the supernatural in the natural, as we have it in the form of Christianity or the Church. It is the very form in which the religion of redemption through Christ actualizes itself in the members of His mystical body. It is humanity in Christ observing and apprehending that by which it is apprehended. It is the manner of life, the ceremonial observed in God's family. It is the custom, the established manner and habit of Christendom, observing the laws and ordinances of divine appointment. It is indeed a form, but a form answering to the general idea of the Church itself. It is not a form without contents, but has as the fulness of its contents and meaning the very objective mystery of redemption. By this it is demanded, as every where objective reality challenges and demands subjective observance.

And this demand is by no means arbitrary; it is internal and vital, and comes in the way of a *free* necessity.

We are beautifully and truly told that "Analogy holdeth in all things." The child of nature, born into it as into a kingdom, is most happy and free in the observance of its laws and the forms of its life. Here too we have a grand temple and a no less grand ceremonial. Strange that no modern fanatic has yet come so far as to declaim against nature's laws and the ritual of natural life. Why not? The great majority of men do not observe these laws "to do them," still less do they love and admire the beautiful forms of natural life by which they are surrounded. And even where it is the custom to observe these grand and beautiful forms, and to acknowledge the presence and power of the kingdom of nature, this is a *formal* observance and acknowledgment. The ceremony is empty. The hearts of the people are not in it. Why not say then that this grand outwardism is not necessary? It is after all an empty form. It does not embody the true natural law and life. Why not say that this is not the true and real kingdom of nature; but "the true kingdom of nature is the assemblage of human hearts held together by the bonds of natural sympathy and love?" It has not yet come to this. Why then, we ask in all earnestness, not allow the law of analogy to have full force? If throughout the whole realm of nature the objective demands the observance of the personal creature, in virtue of their concrete union, must there not be a corresponding demand, in virtue of a similar relation, in the new creation? Here we have the new heavens and the new earth; here all things are new. Here all forms of life glow with the brightest glory. Here the divine law, the divine love, yea the divinity itself is revealed in its highest form. Here we have that grand form of existence before us which is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

Now our argument is this, namely, that to be required to behold Him, and to behold His glory as it is passing before us, without beholding the *form* of its revelation, is to demand an impossibility; just an impossibility like to that of demanding that

we form a proper conception of God as the Creator, without taking into account the Creation.

Only as we stand consciously in the Creation, of which we are integral parts, can we attain the consciousness that He is our Creator. To know, to love and to worship Him as the Almighty Maker of heaven and earth, we must needs know this form of His self-manifestation. The God consciousness in every stage of its development, involves the objective consciousness. We are conscious that we live, move, and have our being in God, at the same time we are just as conscious that our life is conditioned by the outward world. God sustains our natural life, not immediately, but mediately. So too as our Creator He reveals His glory in the creation, and in this *form* demands our love and the heart's adoration. To close the eye upon the outward order of nature is then to shut out also the supernatural light. To turn away the mind from the form of the divine self-manifestation is to turn it away from God Himself. Of this the sin and fall of man is the melancholy illustration. When his relation to God became abnormal, then his relation to the works which God had made also became abnormal. When he fell nature also fell. Its light became darkness, just because the divine life and light within had become extinct. From this it follows that the restoration of man to his normal relation must remove the curse of his sin from the objective creature as well as from himself. The objective is essential to the subjective. There can be no humanity without it. Hence the necessity of an objective redemption as well as subjective, in other words a new creation answering in full to the first creation.

God in glorifying Himself in the redemption of the personal creature also glorifies Himself in and through the impersonal, not the one now and the other then, not the one here and the other there, but in one continuous act of self-manifestation and glorification, in the form of the new creation in Christ Jesus, which, like the old, must need be personal and impersonal. The Church accordingly is both subjective and objective; the outward form is as essential to the inner life, as the inner life is to the outward form. And just as natural life is sustained

and nourished through a complexity of natural means, so the Christian life is nourished through complexity of Church ordinances and means of grace.

Is nature then a mediatrix between God and man? Must we needs look to God through nature? Can we not go to God and cannot He come to us immediately? We answer: nature is not mediatrix in an outward way; but in and through nature God comes to us, giving us the bread, and communicating to us the strength we need. So precisely in the sphere of the new Creation. Here we need not now to ask the question; "is the Church mediatrix between God and man?" Must we come to God through the Church to be saved? Is there not "One Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus?" The answer is given us: The Church is the *form* of Christ's mediatorship. "One Mediator of course, just as there is one Creator, but the mediatorship must be real, just as the creation is real. A mere ideal mediator will avail us just as little as an ideal creator. To know God as creator we must stand consciously in the creation. To know His Son who creates all things new, we must stand consciously in the new creation. To know Him as Mediator we must stand consciously in His mediatorial kingdom. The Roman Catholic divine says, you must enter the Church in order to come to Christ. He seems to view the Church as mediatrix between men and Christ. The Protestant, certain of victory in the contest, says: you must come to Christ first, then you join the Church afterwards. Both forms of conception are calculated to mislead. In fact there is no such thing as coming to the Church first and then afterwards to Christ. Nor is there any such thing as coming to Christ first and then after awhile to the Church. Christ and his Church do not thus stand apart so as to make it possible to come to either one without coming to the other. Why not be true to the analogy of the Divine Word? "The Church is the body of Christ." Can you then be a member of the body even a day or an hour without being a member of Christ? Can you be vitally united to Christ even for a moment without being a member of His body?

Let us take another example, one from the Lord's own teaching. In John iii. 5, the way of entrance into the kingdom of heaven is declared to be the new birth. This is brought to view in contrast with natural birth. The infant born into the kingdom of nature lives and moves and has its being in God. Did it come into this vital relation to God first, then afterwards into the kingdom of nature? Or did it come into the Kingdom of nature first, then afterwards to God? To see these questions before us in this form really seems silly and foolish. No one will stultify himself by taking the affirmative side in either case. All admit that the very birth is a *natural* mystery, which is grounded in Him who is the giver of all life. Yet when we come to the beginning of the higher life, of which the natural is the illustration and type, namely, entrance into the kingdom of Christ, in the way of regeneration, theologians show tremendous polemical power and skill in the discussion of the question; "Do men come first into the kingdom of Christ, then to Christ, or do they first come to Christ then into His Kingdom? The analogy instituted by our blessed Lord settles the question beyond dispute. The Kingdom of grace is not a moment without its king, nor is there a single part of His gracious realm in which He is not always present. Entrance into it is therefore impossible without at the same time coming to Him, just as on the other hand it is not possible to come to Him first, and then subsequently into His kingdom.

To be born again of water and the Spirit, into Christ's Kingdom, is to have Him formed (born) in us the hope of glory, and to have Him thus born and living in us is to be in His kingdom. "I in you, ye in me."

This proper conception of the Church of Christ, or of His kingdom, as the form of His presence as before intimated, is essential to the development of the idea of the Christian Ritual. As there can be no sound theology without the true idea of the "Theos," and as there can be no sound Christology without the proper apprehension of Christ's Person, so there can be no proper religious observance unless it ground itself upon the proper apprehension of His presence. If He be present to our

minds as the Christ of the Gnostics, who denied His humanity, whilst they adhered to His divinity, our worship will be Gnostic worship. It may be very spiritual indeed, very intelligent and devout, yet it is not the true Christian worship. The cross and atonement are wanting.

If Christ be present with us, as He was present to the pious Ebionite, who denied His Godhead, whilst he believed Him to be very man, our worship will be like his. If He be present, finally, in the Nestorian view, which acknowledges both His divinity and humanity, but denies their hypostatical union, our worship can neither have the true Christian spirit nor the proper Christian form. And so on to the end of the chapter. The question of Christ's true presence must therefore settle the question of the Christian worship. It determines not only the fact of the observance, but also the form and manner. As the Christian religion in general is the historical continuation of the incarnation fact, in other words, as it is Christ's life repeating itself continuously in the way of a real historical process, it is indeed the very type and formative principle of the true ritual. They are related as the contents and form, as life and the form of its development. The true Ritual is not a form of worship prescribed by the Church in any given period of her history; nor is it a form divinely given, in any outward way, to remind us of spiritual realities above and beyond itself; still less is it a form of religious art. It is the objective mystery of Christianity itself, the great mystery of godliness, God manifested in the flesh, in the form of the Church. THE CHURCH, WE SAY, the grand Temple of Christ's humanity with the real indwelling shekinah, is the primary normal Ritual and the religious observance, the worship in this tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man, that answers fully to its divine idea, is the *true* Christian worship. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship in spirit and in truth:" Not in the spirit merely, or as moved by the Spirit, the truth apart; but in spirit AND IN

TRUTH—the truth as now revealed in Christ's person, and in the economy of grace—the truth, which stands upon the immovable pillar and ground of the Church.

In this house of prayer, more glorious than the former building because the Lord of life and glory ministers therein, all the forms of religious life and worship are divinely prescribed, or, which is the same thing, pre-determined. In other words, the Christian religion is ritualistic. Unfolding itself as it does in the form of the Church it *necessarily* develops the ritualistic principle, for the obvious reason that the divinely ordained means of grace, such as the preaching of the Gospel, the Sacraments, and prayer, are in their living relation to the Great Head of the Church religious rites which He Himself has instituted.

In arriving at this conclusion we are aware that we run the risk of laying ourselves open to the charge of favoring a ritualistic tendency which even the most orthodox and devout of the Evangelical Churches consider dangerous and false. The terms, "High Church," "Ritual," and "Ritualism," are in bad repute, because in some Churches antichrist is the minister, clothed in more gorgeous robes than even the glorified Christ or His apostles would wear, where there are rites and ceremonies, an ecclesiastical dandyism and display at which the devout Jew and Pagan even would blush; where all is form, display, and fashion.

It is not surprising at all that such a ceremonial which evidently does not stand in the law of life in Christ Jesus, should have excited the prejudice of good people against Ritual as such, so much so that they think it an evil per se, and make a virtue of declaiming against it. This, however just, as we have shown is no less an error than the other. It is also antichrist.

For the same reason the term Catholic as applied to the Church has also fallen into bad repute. Thousands of professing Christians are unwilling to be called Catholics because the Romanists are known by this name and claim to be the "Holy Catholic Church." Shall we declaim therefore against churchliness and catholicity? By doing so we concede to the Ro-

manists all they wish. We do not retain for ourselves an inch of ground upon which to plant the standard of truth which the Spirit of God has lifted up against error. *No*, *no*, we must not give up our spiritual birth-right. If the Jewish and to some extent the Pagan ceremonial are received in the Church of Rome, and the Church of England so far as in sympathy with Rome, shall we leave the One Holy Catholic Church, the sacraments, the solemn rites which Christ has ordained? No, let us with these, and in the name of Christ, oppose all false Ritual and every form of error which like a flood is coming in upon us from every side. The truth must stand, and the true worship will be continued even after the heavens and the earth shall have passed away.

ART. IV.—FAITH IN CHRIST AND FAITH IN DOCTRINE COMPARED AND CONTRASTED.

BY PRESIDENT JAMES MCCOSH, D.D.

THERE is a well-known tale of a young woman coming to a Scotch minister to be admitted to the Lord's Table, of his examining her as to her knowledge of the truths of religion, of his finding her, as he thought, lamentably ignorant, and refusing her the privilege she was seeking; but as she retired she burst into tears and the expression was wrung from her "though I cannot speak for my Saviour, I could die for Him," an appeal which could not be resisted. I am in this paper to discourse, first, of the faith that saves; and secondly, of the faith in truth which a man can utter and expound. The one of these is spontaneous, direct, looking immediately on Christ, living upon Him and by Him, and may be called Saving Faith; the other is reflective, looking to general truth, and may be called Doctrinal Faith.

I. "The just shall live by faith" (Hab. ii. 4, compared with Rom. i. 17). This faith is distinguished from sense and sight. "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed" (John xx. 29). Sense perceives the things immediately before

it, as colors, shapes, sounds and the round of occurrences in our world from day to day and from year to year. Faith looks to things which are not seen. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." But faith is quite as natural an exercise of mind as sight is. We all believe in things which we have not seen and may never see, as in distant lands and remote events, of the existence of India and China, of old empires and geological epochs. There is an idea entertained by some that faith is a very mysterious thing, visionary, unreal, inexpressible and inexplicable, as incomprehensible as some of the grand objects at which it looks; and they excuse themselves in consequence from seeking what they conceive to be so difficult to catch, or they content themselves with clasping a cloud when they might have a substantial reality. Now there is no operation of mind more simple in itself or which we are called on more frequently to exercise than faith. The boy believes in the affection of his father, the pupil in the knowledge of his teacher, the youth in the trustworthiness of his bosom friend, the husbandman in the seasons, the patient in the medicines of his physician, the merchant in the connection between demand and supply, and the scholar in the value of research. Religion in requiring us to exercise faith is not demanding anything unreasonable or unnatural. Change the object to which it is directed: let it be a faith not in an earthly, but in our heavenly Father; not in an erring human teacher, but a Divine and infallible one; not in a friend who may fail in the time of need, but one "that sticketh closer than a brother;" not in a general who may himself fall in the fight, but one who has gained the victory and will make us conquerors and more than conquerors; not in the drugs which cure the body, but the blood of Christ which heals the soul; not in the revolution of the seasons, but the grander movements of God's providence; not in the laws which regulate the acquisition and distribution of wealth, but in the connection of sin and suffering, of holiness and heaven; not in the value of human scholarship, but of Divine learning. Columbus believed in a world beyond the then known world, sailed towards it and reached it; the

Christian believes in a world beyond the grave, and betakes himself to the ark which is to carry him to it.

But the question is started, What is faith psychologically, that is as an exercise of the mind? Is it an act of the head, or of the heart? Of the understanding, or the feelings? Of both? of one? or of which? To this questioning I reply first that all these phrases need to be explained. So far as they are in popular use they are vague, ambiguous; so far as they belong to mental science no two metaphysicians explain them alike. We need not appeal to the inspired record to settle such questions scientifically, for Scripture is not a book of psychological any more than it is of astronomical or chemical science. It speaks of the stars, the elements, of air and water as they are noticed by common observation; and it speaks of the faculties of the mind in the same manner: not forming a new nomenclature which it would be difficult to comprehend and arduous to study, but employing the phrases which it found in use at the time. Some represent the whole controversy as settled by Rom. x. 10: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." But the most cursory examination is sufficient to show that the word "heart" has a considerably different signification in the Old and New Testaments from what it has in literature and common conversation among us. We now denote by it simply the feelings—we understand by the head, we feel with the heart. But in the Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek use of the term men are spoken of as understanding with the heart, as Mat. xiii. 15: "The people's heart is waxed gross," "lest they should understand with their heart." One without heart is one without understanding. "Ephraim is like a silly dove without heart" (Hos. vii. 11, see also Job xxxviii. 36; Prov. x. 8; Is. vi. 9, &c.) Imaginations come from the heart. "Every imagination of man's heart is only evil." (Gen. vi. 2). In Holy writ the word evidently stands for inward thought and feeling of every kind, and includes all the various kinds of reflection, purposing and sentiment which pass in the mind prior to action. When the shepherds visited Mary after the birth of the babe, "She kept all these things and pon-

dered them in her heart." (Luke ii. 19). When Jesus at the age of twelve lingered in Jerusalem and drew forth the wonder of the people as He conversed with the doctors, "Mary kept all these things in her heart." (ii. 52).

"With the heart man believeth," but with the heart in the Scripture use of the word, that is with the inward man: not of the mere feelings which are called bowels in Scripture, but of the head and heart in the modern use of the terms. You may have observed that while the phrases "believe" and "faith" occur so frequently in the New Testament they are more rarely found in the Old Testament. But we have the authority of the Apostle Paul (Rom. iv.), for saying that the plan of salvation is the same in the two dispensations; that men were saved under the Old Testament as they are under the New by faith. The phrase more frequently in the Old Testament is "trust," less frequently "confide." Every reader of Scripture must have noticed the frequent expressions of trust in the Psalms and the prophets and the commands to trust in Him. "The Lord is good; Blessed is the man that trusteth in Him" (Ps. xxxiv. 8). "God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid" (Is. xii. 2). Combining and comparing such passages we see that faith implies an exercise of the higher affections of the soul. If we draw, as I believe, we may and ought, the distinctions of modern mental science, and apply them to Scripture, then we have to say that understanding, will, and feeling are all implied in faith. There must be understanding, for how can we believe in a thing of which we have no notion? This is implied in Rom. x. 14, "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard;" v. 17, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." But the faith that saves is more than a mere intellectual judgment: it is trust, it is confidence, and this comprises an exercise of will; it involves the power of choice. We attach ourselves to Him, we accept of Him, we cast ourselves on Him, we rest upon Him. According to this view faith consists of an assent of the understanding with the consent of the will, and these two raising feeling according to the nature of the truths apprehended and believed in.

Some in these days are forever telling us that religion is an affair of the heart and not the head. They show us that a speculative assertion of dogma without love is cold, unattractive, offensive. They remind us that the sacrifice could not rise to heaven without a fire to kindle it. All true, I allow, but it is equally true that mere emotion without an object intelligently apprehended will turn out to be void, empty, evanescent, ready to evaporate. If there be no acceptable offering till it is kindled, it is equally clear that the fire and the wood will be meaningless without a lamb for a burnt-offering (Gen. xxii. 7). Why insist on separating what the Lord hath joined together—like male and female in marriage—first in the constitution of our mind and then in the affection of His people, the union of the firm with the flexible. I should certainly deplore to find any one resting contented with a faith without feeling; but it is equally vain to try to rise to a stablished assurance without first gaining the conviction of the understanding.

Religious faith is specially faith in God as revealed to us. God hath so far made Himself known to us in nature. It is therefore, a faith in God as seen in His works fashioned so skilfully, in His providence ordered so wisely. But then God has been pleased to make a particular revelation of Himself in His word to man as a fallen and erring being. Religious faith then is specially a belief in the testimony which God hath given of Himself in the Scriptures. But God hath there manifested Himself to us in the face of His Son. "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son who is in His bosom He hath revealed Him." The faith that saves is a faith in Christ, the Saviour. "What is faith?" asked a minister of a poor woman, a member of his congregation. "Faith," she answered, "is just taking God at His word." God says, "I have so loved sinners as to give my Son to die for them." Faith responds, "Lord, I believe it." God says, "Here is the gift of my Son." Faith replies, "I take Thee at Thy word, I close in with and accept Thy gracious offer." The faith which appropriates Christ, brings us into a covenant-relation with God, and we enter upon possession of the blessings which have been purchased.

We can discover, so I think, an appropriateness in faith being made the instrument of saving the sinner. We see that some other proposed means are inapplicable and impracticable. Some would have the sinner's restoration to favor depend on his repentance and on the obedience rendered ; as if genuine repentance did not require that the sinner should first be reconciled, as if obedience rendered by a sinner unreconciled could be accepted by God. Or, some may say, let the sinner first love God and then he will be pardoned. But the difficulty is to kindle love in a heart alienated from God. In order to obedience, in order to love there must first be a turning to God, there must be a resting on Him: and what is this but faith? In faith we submit to Him, we bow ourselves before Him ; He is pacified towards us, and the stream of affection which had been restrained is ready to flow forth; we are ready to receive what He is ready to give, and it becomes in us "a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

When the sinner is justified by faith we are not to understand that faith justifies as being a work. This would be falling back on the legal system of justification, by works or merit. We hear persons saying in doubt or in scorn, "Oh, how should there be so great merit in faith to save the sinner?" But we have only to reflect for a moment to discover that there is no merit in faith to save the sinner. One reason why faith is chosen as the means of saving us that it has and can have no merit. "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith" (Rom. iii. 27). "Not of works lest any man should boast" (Eph. ii. 9). Faith is in its very nature lowly and dependent; it looks to another, it leans upon another. It is the mere mean or channel through which the blessings which Christ purchased flow into the soul in rich profusion. Now it is required of a medium or channel, that it be clear of obstruction, that there be nothing in it to stop that which is meant to pass through it. Herein lies the great efficacy of faith: it receives that which is given it, and through it the virtue that is in Christ flows into the soul and enriches and satisfies it.

What a power even in our earthly faiths: as when men sow in the assurance that they shall reap after a long season, and labor in the confidence of a reward at a far distance. What an efficacy in the trust which the child reposes in the parent, which the scholar places in his master, which the soldier puts in his general, which the lover commits to the person beloved. These are among the chief potencies which have been moving mankind to good, or, alas, to evil. As it walks steadfastly on it discovers an outlet where to sense the way seemed shut in and closed. Difficulties give way as it advances, and impossibilities to prudence become accomplishments before the energy of faith. To it we owe the greatest achievements which mankind have effected in art, in travel, in conquest: setting out in search of the unseen they have made it seen and palpable. It was thus that Columbus persevered till the long-looked for country burst upon his view. It is always thus that men discover new lands and new worlds outside those previously known. It takes us as it were to a mountain-top and widens the horizon of our vision.

But how much more potent is faith in God. It carries, and this according to the measure of it the power of God. It is the attracting power that keeps the soul circulating round the Fountain of Lights, as the earth does round the sun and is illuminated by it. It is no doubt weak in that it leans, but it is strong in that it leans on the arm of the Omnipotent. It is a creature impotency which lays hold of the Creator's power. It can do more than remove mountains, it can take away a load of sin lying on the conscience and the heart. "We are justified by faith," says Paul (Rom. v. 1). "It purifies the heart," says Peter (Acts xv. 9). It "worketh by love," says Paul in another epistle (Gal. v. 6). It "overcometh the world," says John (1 Ep. v. 4). It is rich, for it serves itself heir to the blessings purchased at a great price and left as an inheritance. There are times when if we had nothing but sense and appearance we should feel as if we were sinking in a dark and bottomless abyss, but by faith we plant our feet on the Rock of Ages and are stayed and established. When the powerful king of

Syria came upon Elisha, shut up in the small and defenceless town of Dothan, the prophet continued calm and unmoved, because he knew that "they that be with us are more than be with them." But his servant when he looked on the horses, the chariots and the great host was in great alarm; and at the request of his master the Lord opened his eyes, and he saw what the prophet had seen all along, "the mountain full of chariots and horses of fire round about Elisha." So if we had faith we should see that the Lord "encampeth about them that fear Him and delivereth them." Faith shows us the land that is far off as if it were near us, as in certain states of our atmosphere the distant mountains look as if they were in our immediate neighborhood. As we walk by faith our eye is lifted from the earth and directed onward and upward, and we travel with the earth beneath our feet and heaven in our eye.

II. "But speak thou the things that become sound doctrine." (Tit. ii. 1.) This is a farther duty. We are first to believe; but we are also to be ready to speak what we believe and put it in the form of sound doctrine.

There is a difference between having a good reason for our faith and giving a good reason for our faith. Every student of logic has heard the story of the Chief Justice of England who on appointing one who had not had the advantage of a legal training to a judicial office, gave him the sagacious counsel: "When you pronounce a decision do not add the reasons. Your decision, from your good sense, will invariably be right; your reasons will often be wrong." Because a plain sincere Christian cannot expound his reasons for believing in the Bible as the Word of God, we are not to conclude that he has no reasons. A very correct process of thought prompted by a good and honest heart may have passed through his mind; but it might require a logician to unfold it. Still it is useful when a man has not only good reasons for himself, but is prepared to obey the command "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." His own faith is strengthened by his being able to fall back upon the evidences when he is tempted to

doubt; and he has many opportunities of convincing, influencing and guiding others.

He is to "speak the things that become sound doctrine." Doctrine or dogma like science is arranged or systematized truth. The truth is revealed by God, but the form and expression of it may be made by man. The truth revealed in the Word is unerring, having the sanction of the God of truth. The arrangement by man may be more or less perfect, more or less imperfect. The truth as revealed, consists of histories, biographies, symbols, types, precepts, promises, warnings, categorical statements as to the character of God and of man scattered over sixty-six books composed by perhaps as many different writers,—some of these having written a number of works, such as Moses, Paul and John, but some of the books such as Psalms and Proverbs being the composition of a number of persons separated from each other by ages. To know these truths as they have been conveyed to us by the inspired writers is all we need to know in order to salvation. I believe there are many now in heaven whose knowledge, when they were on earth, of the truths revealed in Scripture was extremely limited. The question has often been put, how little may a man believe and yet be saved? The question is a curious rather than a profitable one. It can be definitely settled only by Him who "knoweth our frame" and can make allowance for circumstances. Every one who is saved, must, I should judge, believe in God the Saviour and have closed in with the gospel offer: but more, he will be ready to believe in all that is revealed, so far as he is able to become acquainted with it. No one must urge the circumstance that his knowledge is so limited as an excuse for not taking steps to know more. It will be the earnest desire of every genuine believer to become versant with all that God has been pleased to make known in the Volume of the Book.

While God by employing men of diversified gifts has made His Word sufficiently varied to suit the tastes of mankind so far as they are healthy, he has not so enlarged it in bulk as to place it beyond the power of an intelligent reader to master its

general contents. Not a few Christians have had the laudable desire to make themselves acquainted with the whole Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. And as man is a rational being he will be impelled to employ his mind about what has been written. "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say." As possessing the capacity of feeling, he would give them a place in his heart, so as endowed with intelligence he would wish to allot them a place in his head, and incorporate them into his thoughts. As the original Scriptures were written in a language which is no longer spoken, so it is needful in order to our understanding or even reading them to translate them, or have them translated for us. Then, there are many words and idioms in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New Testament which have nothing corresponding to them in English, and in order to bring them within our tongue and our comprehension we must exercise judgment upon them and choose the fittest phrase to express them. And among not a few there will be a strong desire to co-ordinate and bring under proper heads what is dispersed—like stars over the sky—in the inspired writings. As there are men of intelligence who have a desire not only to know individual plants but to have plants classified, not only to know the separate stars in the sky, but to group the heavenly bodies into constellations and determine the laws which join planet to sun and star to star; so there are men who would tabulate the events of sacred history, who would formulize the several precepts and combine the scattered proportions in the form of sound words.

Then, there are circumstances ever casting up in the history of the Church, which require us to put truth in a definite shape, not only for the benefit of the individual but of the Church at large. As we might expect from the tendency of mankind to err, and as the inspired writers themselves have predicted, there spring up persons who misunderstand the Word, and give a wrong interpretation of it—men unstable as water, unlearned and unstable, who wrest the writings of Paul and the other Scriptures to their own destruction. There must be some way, not it may be of excluding these men from the communion of the

Church, but of becoming the teachers of others to confuse and mislead them. But then it is said you may use the Scriptures themselves for this purpose. And it is true that the appeal must always be, at the commencement and the close, to the Word of God. But the subject of dispute here is as to the meaning of Scripture. They profess to be willing to accept what the Bible teaches, but they give an utterly perverse interpretation of it. Thus in the fourth century there arose a body of men who denied that Jesus was truly God equal with the Father, and tortured the words of Scripture to defend their heretical opinions. There required therefore to be some means of ascertaining the sense in which persons understood the Scriptures; some test to try whether they regarded Christ as truly God; so the theologians of the age devised a nomenclature by which to exclude those who denied the Divinity of our Lord, who were required to say that He was of one substance with the Father. Hence the necessity and the use of creeds and confessions.

Doctrinal propositions either when couched in Scripture language or drawn directly from Scripture, serve several important ends. It is true that faith in them is never to be substituted for faith in the living God and the living Saviour. Few things in this world are more offensive than head knowledge without corresponding practice; than an uncharitable scowling orthodoxy with no humble and loving faith in the loving Saviour. This is, in fact, the very essence of Pharisaism, which has been felt to be so repulsive in all ages. Its sternness is apt to dignify itself with the name of high principle; but if it be without affection, it is without the essential principle of Christianity, which is love, being the highest perfection in the character of Him who is expressively called love. But if faith in doctrine is conjoined with faith in Christ it accomplishes some very high purposes. First, it makes our ideas clearer, and keeps our thoughts, meditations, and expressions consistent. It is of special value to teachers, as it enables them to expound the truth more clearly and consecutively to their hearers, who can take it up more readily and profitably, and call it back into the memory more readily and frequently. It is not necessary

that they should always trouble their audience with the ratiocination which has satisfied themselves. John Foster remarks of the great preacher Robert Hall, that he gave his hearers the results of profound thinking without the processes that led to it. I am of opinion that the perspicuous and brief exposition of the grounds or principles of a great truth might be profitable in a sermon addressed to an intelligent audience, quite as much so as a sensational appeal to the imagination or the feelings. But whether he chooses to speak of it to his people or not, there should always be a regulating principle of sound doctrine in his own mind, guiding and guarding the preacher. This will keep him from mistakes into which he might otherwise fall, on the one side or the other, while it would give him a fearlessness in proclaiming the full and many-sided truth; say the freedom of the gospel offer on the one hand, and the sovereignty of God on the other. But sound doctrine may be profitable not only to the teacher, but to the private Christian. Even the good woman that I referred to in the opening of this discourse might have been all the better had she been able to speak about Christ as she was ready to die for Him. A clear apprehension of divine truth will save a private Christian from many inconsistencies, into which he might otherwise fall without being aware of it, say from imprudences and sins into which impulse might hurry him, and which might greatly hinder his progress in the divine life, and bring disgrace on the cause of Christ. A man may be a very good mechanic without knowing natural philosophy; a very good gardener without knowing botany; but they will be the greater proficients in their art provided they know the scientific principles on which it is founded. So a man may be a good Christian though he has not studied theology; but he will be a higher style of Christian, and will carry more weight when he is able to condense his vague knowledge into a brief and comprehensive form of sound words.

There are doctrinal statements, so I hold, in the Word of God. True, the early Scriptures do not contain many general or abstract propositions. They do not commence as our catechisms and Church articles do with enunciations as to the being

and character of God, as to the nature and destiny of man. The God who made us knows how to suit His instructions to us, and begins as the mind of man does in its natural progress—as you see the child does—with the singular and the concrete, with incidents, with biographies, with operations of God, and deeds of man, with the creation, the fall, the promise of the Seed of the woman, with the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, the flood, the dispersion of mankind, the call of Abraham, the going down into Egypt, the preservation of the family by means of Joseph, the exodus under Moses. But from an early date, and as mankind were prepared to abstract and generalize there come up general expressions which read as if they were the articles of a confession. The doctrine still comes in under the form of a particular proposition. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," (Gen. i. 1). "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him," (i. 27). "Every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil continually," (vi. 5). "Abraham believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness," (xv. 6). "The Lord passed by before Moses and proclaimed 'The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty," (Exod. xxxiv. 6). "Hear, oh Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," (Deut. vi. 4). The declarations of this kind become more numerous as men's minds are enlarged, and they are able to understand them. The psalms are full of lofty spiritual thoughts and moral maxims, expressed in lively poetical form, fitted to strike the fancy, and likely to stick in the memory; out of the prophets you could draw a full creed, theological and ethical. Our Lord opens the New Testament dispensation even as Moses introduced the Old by examples. He thus encouraged little children to draw nigh to Him, while other teachers would drive them away. The common people ever heard him gladly, and rejoiced in his instruction, because He taught them not by subtleties like the scribes, but by self-evidencing statements which shone in their

own light. Still you find coming out in our Lord's teaching a number of grand truths wide and all-embracing as the canopy of heaven which ever widens as we seem to approach its boundaries. "I and my Father are one," (John x. 30). "Except ye be born again ye cannot see the kingdom of heaven," (John iii. 3). "Except ye repent ye shall all perish," (Luke xiii. 3). "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me though he were dead, yet shall he live" (John xi. 25). When He left the earth our Lord gave a promise to His disciples that the Spirit would guide them into all truth, and the Epistles of the Apostles which contain the latest revelation of the mind of God are full of doctrinal statements. In the Epistles of Paul and Peter, especially in the Epistle to the Romans, we have a complete exposition and defence of Christian doctrine, and from these any one could draw a complete creed expressed in Scripture language.

I admit that there must be stringent limits imposed on the formation of doctrines, and the imposition of creeds on individuals and on Churches. First, we must see that they are drawn directly and easily from the Word of God. The generalizations we make must be of the statements of Scripture and not of the dicta of our reason, not even of our experience as Christians. The great German theologian, Schleiermacher, made Christian divinity an expression and embodiment of Christian consciousness. But this is to reverse the proper order of things, to put that which is first last, and that which is last first; it is to make our experience determine the doctrine instead of making the infallible truth of the Word determine and guide our experience. It is not the shadow on the dial which regulates the time, for the dial may be displaced and become mistimed; but it is the sun in the heavens that should regulate both the dial, and the time which the dial simply indicates. Secondly, no mere human speculation, however plausible it may seem to those who favor it, must be allowed a place in what professes to be Bible doctrine. Philosophers are at liberty to speculate as they please, on the numerous topics brought before us in the Divine Word. But the conclusions which they reach

are to be regarded as lying in the region of philosophical speculation and not of Scriptural truth. The history of philosophy and of metaphysical theology, shows how certain men are to wander when they pass beyond the things revealed, and venture into the region of the secret things which belong to the Lord our God. A celebrated reformer used to represent angels as amusing themselves with the folly of the discussions in which theologians engage, often with such dogmatism and bitterness. The rash assertions which divines have made when they drew an astronomy or a geology out of the visual description of phenomena in the Word, are full of instruction and rebuke to those who would rear theories out of Scripture by human logic. No one should boast that he has been able to rise to a full comprehension of all the truths which God has been pleased so far to reveal to us. "We know," yes we know, but we know in part only. We who dwell in a world "where day and night alternate," we who go everywhere accompanied by our own shadow —a shadow produced by our dark body, but produced because there is light—cannot expect to be absolutely delivered from the darkness. Man's faculties, exquisitely adapted to the sphere in which he moves, were never intended to enable him to comprehend all truth. The mind is in this respect like the eye. The eye is so constituted as to perceive the things within a certain range, but as objects are removed farther and farther from us, they become more and more indistinct and at length are lost sight of altogether. It is the same with the human mind. It can understand certain subjects and to a certain distance, but as they reach away farther they look more and more confused, and at length they disappear from the view. And if the human spirit attempts to mount higher than its proper elevation it will find all its flights fruitless. The dove (to use an illustration of Kant's), may mount to a certain elevation in the heavens, but as she rises the air becomes lighter, and at length she finds that she can no longer float upon its bosom, and should she attempt to soar higher her pinions flutter in emptiness and she falters and falls. So it is with the spirit of man; it can wing its way a certain distance into the expanse above it, but

there is a limit which if it endeavors to pass, it will find all its conceptions void and its ratiocinations unconnected. Placed as we are in the centre of boundless space and in the middle of eternal ages we can see only a few objects immediately around us, and all others fade in outline as they are removed from us by distance, till at length they lie altogether beyond our vision. And this remark holds true not only of the more ignorant of those whose eye can penetrate the least distance; it is true also of the learned; it is perhaps true of all created beings, that there is a bounding sphere of darkness surrounding the space rendered clear by the torch of science. Nay it almost looks as if the wider the boundaries of science are pushed and the greater the space illuminated by it, the greater in proportion the bounding sphere into which no rays penetrate just as (to use a very old comparison), when we strike up a light in the midst of darkness, in proportion as the light becomes stronger, so does also that surface black and dark which is rendered visible.

And so when we profess to expound Christian doctrine, we must be careful to avoid all wire-drawn distinctions, all mere dialectic processes involving abstruse notions and complicated trains of reasoning. In very many of the awfully profound subjects discussed in theology we may fall into fatal error on one side or other when we begin to argue from Scripture instead of simply accepting it. What is called Inferential Theology, that is theology made up of inferences from Scripture, should be confined within very stringent limits. Certainly we have no right to impose conclusions of our own on men who may be willing to accept Scripture on the fair interpretation of it. In the construction of creeds of every kind, advantage must be taken of the generalized statements of the inspired writers, specially of the Epistles of the Apostles. We should also look to the confessions which have been drawn out in various ages of the Church to express the faith of God's people, and guard against heresy; in the Apostles' creed—which is an old one, though it does not go back to the time of the Apostles; in the Nicene Creed; in the Lutheran and Calvinistic Confessions; in the Heidelberg Catechism; the Westminster Confession of

Faith and Shorter Catechism; and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. Not that any Christian is bound to accept these because they have been constructed by great and good men, or adopted by Churches. Every one is entitled, nay, bound to judge for himself *de novo*, and as if no one had examined it before, all that is offered to his belief. But when he has done so, and then consults the Confessions that have been drawn out by various Churches in various ages, he will find that there is a wonderful *consensus* as to all important doctrine, and that the faith of all times has been virtually the same; and as he notices this, his views will thereby be rendered clearer, and his assurance confirmed and strengthened.

But it is recommended to us to make our creed as wide, as loose as possible, lest we exclude any of God's chosen ones from the fellowship of the Church. They warn us, that by imposing too much we may lay a burden on the conscience which it is not able to bear, which may, in fact, crush weak believers, and stir up others to rebellion. There is some wisdom, but more folly, in this counsel. Yielding to the judgment of charity, we are not to exclude a man from the communion of saints because his creed seems to us to be scanty. Nor are we to require of teachers in the Church a profession of faith in logical distinctions or speculative theories, or, indeed, in anything beyond what is written in the Word, and so written that "he who runs may read." But, on the other hand, we must employ wise and firm means to secure that they who are officially set apart to teach others "continue in the apostles' doctrine" (Acts ii. 42), and hold fast the form of sound words which they have heard of Paul and the other apostles (2 Tim. i. 13). We are warned against being "children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive" (Eph. iv. 14). Such men, with or without knowing it, lead others into confusion, inconsistencies, and even heresy; they are blind leaders of the blind, whereby both fall into the ditch. As to creed, a Church is not acting wisely, is not acting faithfully, when it utters an uncertain sound. And as to direct spontaneous faith,

it is wrong to recommend any one to believe as little as possible. All are to be ready to believe what God has been pleased to reveal. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. iii. 16). Every truth there revealed has no doubt a purpose to serve: to increase our knowledge, to strengthen our faith, to enlarge our love, to warm our feelings, to warn, to rebuke, to encourage, to comfort, and so far as any one refuses to accept any inspired declaration, he may be losing the benefits which it is fitted to convey. Scientific experiment shows, that if any of the constituents of the sunbeam be obstructed by artificial means, the plant on which it shines will be apt to take an unnatural, a sickly hue; and when men are indisposed to receive any of those truths given by inspiration, and which are profitable each for a purpose, it will turn out that their piety is so far unhealthy, misformed, and they are "not perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

But then it is urged, that many excellent, nay, devoted Christians have had a very limited apprehension of doctrine, nay, have held erroneous tenets. They show us that there was genuine faith in the middle ages when images were used in worship, when priests claimed the power of forgiving sin, and when it was the general belief that persons could be justified by ritual observances. They prove that there must be genuine love to God in the hearts of members of the Romish Church, notwithstanding its corruptions. They remind us, that in these latter ages there have been men—and they point to Chevalier Bunsen—who, with a very defective creed, have had a fervent affection for the Saviour. They are always quietly insinuating or boldly telling us that there is no connection between soundness in the faith, and genuine piety. "Let the heart," they say, "be right, and it is of little moment in what state the head may be." "Men are to be judged not by what they believe, but by what they do." "Faith, not doctrine, is the principal thing," say some. "Action, not faith, is the principal thing,"

say others, or perhaps the same persons—without perceiving their inconsistency. Now, there is an immense conglomeration of confusion first, and by implication of misleading error, in these representations, or rather misrepresentations. A sinner I acknowledge may be saved by faith with very little knowledge; but this does not show that he can have faith without any knowledge; it does not prove that he should not be a better Christian were he to add to his faith knowledge, and it does not tend to indicate that those who have true faith will not be always prompted to seek higher knowledge. The disciples, when they first believed, and even after our Lord had been employed for three years in training them, had a very limited knowledge; but for this He rebuked them, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe;" and they were ready to receive instruction which He was ever imparting to them, and when He went up to heaven He promised the Spirit to guide them into all truth. When Jesus told Peter that he must suffer many things, and be killed, the Apostle took Him and began to rebuke Him (Matt. xiii. 22); yet this same Apostle lived to write, "For Christ also hath once suffered for us, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God" (1 Pet. iii. 18). Many mediæval Christians had very imperfect, indeed erroneous, views on many important points; but this did not help, it rather hindered, their piety, giving it a perverted twist, or a sickly, mystic hue. And we who live in the full mid-day should not seek to go back to the twilight of the middle ages. I admit that not a few have had a genuine faith with a very scanty or even erroneous formalized creed; that some, ready to die for Christ, have been able to speak for Him only in a very confused manner, not unmixed with heresy. But then I could show that their defective belief has somewhat distorted their piety, giving it, it may be, a monkish, mawkish appearance, as if it had been reared in a cloister, rather than in the fresh, open air of heaven; this, on the one hand, or on the other hand, stiffening their character into rationalism—as in the case of John Locke—and leading them to overlook or set aside truths which might have imparted a fervor to their feelings, or an impulse to their active

benevolence; or, what is as frequent, tempting them to neglect certain common-place duties in attending to others more showy or sensational. And then, some of those who have expressed their faith very imperfectly, have had a very full and enlarged spontaneous faith in their God and Saviour; thus I have been able to testify of Bunsen, that during the five days I spent with him we never conversed "for ten minutes at a time without his returning, however far he might be off, to his Bible and his Saviour, as the objects that were evidently the dearest to him."*

A living historian, of great literary ability, in addressing an old Scottish university, has shown by a large induction of facts, how extensive and intensive has been the influence in various ages and countries, of a belief in such doctrines as the unbending righteousness of God, and the predestination of all things. The portrait which he has drawn of Calvinism, is not a true picture, but a caricature, an undue prominence being given to certain features, and others are sunk out of view. But Mr. Froude has had a glimpse of the intimate connection between a belief in such grand truths, and great and heroic character. "These were men possessed of all the qualities which give nobility and grandeur to human nature—men whose life was as upright as their intellect was commanding, and their public aims untainted with selfishness; unalterably just where duty required them to be stern, but with the tenderness of a woman in their hearts; frank, true, cheerful, humorous, as unlike sour as it is possible to imagine any one, and able in some way to sound the key-note to which every brave and faithful heart in Europe instinctively vibrated." † The faith of some of these men may have been joined with error, not so much in their hearts or convictions, as in the partial, one-sided expressions which they employed in setting forth and defending their dogmas, logically to face opposition. But it was not the associated error, but the essential truth, which made these men true, courageous, and steadfast. There were misapprehensions in the view which Columbus took of the country he discovered—he thought it was part of the

* See Life by his widow.

† Calvinism, by James Anthony Froude.

East Indies; but he had risen to the comprehension of the grand truth that the earth was round, and that there was land to be reached by sailing east from Europe; and in this faith he sought out and found the new world. So there may have been imperfections in the creed of these heroic men; but there was a direct faith, which not only saved their souls from inward and outward corruption, but imparted to them indomitable energy. And it is only so far as men hold by the same heart of truth, that they can rise to the same elevation of character, and devotedness of life. Mr. Froude does not seem to see this. There is no evidence that Mr. Froude himself believes in the truth which has made these men so true and so valiant in the past. He talks vaguely, as the whole school of Thomas Carlyle do, of men being lovers of truth, and brave; as if men could be lovers of truth, who left themselves no truth to believe in, or could be expected to be brave, when they have no great cause to fight for. As it was in ages past, so is it now, so it must be in ages to come; it is faith in eternal rectitude, and unmerited love, that stirs up to deeds of benevolence and self-sacrifice. "In the better sort of men," says Mr. Froude, "there are two elementary convictions: that there is over all things, an unsleeping, inflexible, all-ordering, just power; and that this power governs the world by law, which can be seen in these effects, and on the obedience to which, and on nothing else, human welfare depends." There is all this, but there is vastly more than this needed; otherwise there will only be a dead faith in an abstraction, or a loose pantheistic dream, which loosens the obligation of duty, and ends in mere intentions, without resolute action. It must be a faith, not in a dead power but a living God, holy and sin-hating; and not in mere law, but in a loving Saviour, who has provided an expiation for those who have broken law.

The conclusion of the whole matter is drawn by the Apostle: "Take heed to thyself, and then to thy doctrine," (1 Tim. iv. 16.) This is the proper order, "take heed to thyself," thy soul's salvation. Without this, faith in dogma will be of no avail. Without this, indeed, there will always be some defect in our

doctrinal belief, some exclusiveness, some harshness in it. Men who have felt the truth, are always the best able to understand it; they understand it because they appreciate it. Knowledge of some kind is implied in faith, but it is equally certain, that they only who believe can rise to the fullest knowledge. Divine truth is always comprehended by the heart, that is, by understanding, faith and feeling. There is truth for all, there is truth for each of the faculties of the mind, that thus the whole soul, and not a mere part, may be drawn to God and good.

Were this the proper place, that feeling is called forth, not by general or abstract truth, but by individual persons or scenes. The speaker who would create an admiration for goodness, must exhibit a good being, performing a good action. If he would excite compassion, he must show us some one in distress. If he would kindle indignation, he must expose to our view a deed of villany. If he would awaken gratitude, he must show us favors conferred on us. It is thus that the evangelists write and call forth deeper feeling than the most high-flown rhetoric. They never interpose between us and the object they exhibit, so as to obstruct the light that comes from him, by common-place exclamations such as "how fine," "how beautiful;" but keeping themselves out of sight, they, as it were, say "behold him for yourselves, and see if he is not lovely." It is thus that the greatest of all teachers acts. Troubling us with no deep abstractions, he presents a succession of concrete pictures, which instantly arrest our attention and call forth the deepest feelings of our nature. He teaches us as one that hath power to unlock the fountains of the heart, and not as the scribes.

We see, too, what is the style of preaching most fitted to the cause of Christ. It is preaching that speaks of Christ and speaks to all. There is a kind of preaching which sprang up in New England an age or two ago, and has since travelled south and west, of which I am not sure. The minister is a well-educated, thinking man, and he reads and ponders on deep subjects most of the week, and he brings

out his peculiar cogitations on the Lord's day. All well I say; the good householder must bring out of his treasure, things new and old; his congregation will not thank him for throwing to them what has cost him nothing; but then, what he brings out of his own thoughts, ingenious it may be, but wire-drawn and abstruse, instead of God's Word to which they are pinned, but from which certainly they do not grow. They are admired excessively by a select number of men and women, who are loud in praise of the preacher, and offer him a constant incense of adulation; but as to your children who compose or ought to compose so large a portion of every congregation, as to your servants, male and female, and your day laborers who have toiled all the week, they might have felt an interest in the truths of God's Word. They might have felt an interest even in the grand old theological distinctions embodying the thoughts of the best men of all ages; but as to the peculiar notions or nostrums of this preacher, they do not understand, and they cannot relish them, and it is no great loss to them that do not. Whenever such a style of preaching prevails, the common people will leave the Churches that require an educated ministry; and I am not sure, but that they ought to do so. It will be a black day for any Church, blacker than that which it may have had to suffer in the days of the bitterest persecution, when it ceases to preach to those, to whom the great preacher was specially sent. "To the poor the gospel is preached." I rather think that there are signs that our merchants, distracted all the week with anxious cares in their offices, wish on the Sabbath day, which they would have to be a day of rest, to be delivered from all farther distractions, and to hear the truths of the Gospel preached—with thoughtfulness no doubt—but giving them the results rather than the processes, and in all simplicity and affection. Of this I am sure, that your truly learned men, when they come out from their books, from their literary and scientific pursuits, to the house of God on the Sabbath, would like to hear such words as Jesus uttered from the ship and on the mountain. Old Horace felt it to be his delight to sing *pueris et*

virginibus, and depend upon it, that the best preaching and the most popular in the end is that which suits the father and his son, the brother and his sister, the mistress and her maid, the learned and the unlearned.

But while you do this, you should not leave the other undone. Take heed to thyself, but "take heed to thy doctrine." We are to beware of falling under the somewhat prevalent feeling, that it is of no moment what a man's doctrinal belief is. Speculative unbelief has even a tendency to undermine our spontaneous faith, and will do so sooner or later. Nothing tends so much to deaden affection as skepticism—it is like a piece of ice at his heart, freezing the general current of feeling that may be circulating there—it is a cold atmosphere in which the plant may live for a little while, but will soon expire. If men have reasoned themselves into the conviction that there is no God, they will soon cease to cherish any affection towards Him, except it may be some remains of a fear like that which men entertain towards ghosts, after they have ceased to believe in them. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Some bred and trained in their youth in a warm region of faith, have retained for a time a considerable amount of fervor in spite of their unbelief; but it fades like a reflection when the source of light and heat has gone. When we gaze on the glow of the evening sky we are inclined to expect, even as we would wish it to continue, but it fades into darkness, as we gaze upon it. So it will be with the fervor of feeling in our hearts, if there is not a body of life and truth behind to keep it up. It is essential to our stability to have clearly defined truth to fall back upon, in times of doubt and perplexity; some anchor to hold us when we might be driven about by every wind of doctrine. Such a form of sound doctrine will not indeed create or excite feeling; but it will stay and stablish feeling and keep it from vanishing like "the morning cloud and early dew which passeth away."

It is a duty which you owe to yourselves to "stand fast in the faith." And it is a duty which you owe to Christ, and to His Church to "keep that which is committed to thy trust;" to

transmit it to the age following and thus help to secure that it may go down to the latest posterity. Not only so; we must as good soldiers of the cross be ready "earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints," and to do so by all proper weapons of learning, of prayer, of affectionate appeal. It is no good sign of students to find them urging as an excuse for slothfulness, that they can save souls without theological learning. Why are youth sent to school or college at all? They might succeed in certain kinds of professional business, they might be useful members of society without this toil of acquiring literature and science. But every one in these days sees that the attainments gained at scholastic institutions is fitted to enlarge the mind and multiply the means of usefulness. Of a like value are the valuable instructions you have received from the able and learned professors in this excellent Theological Seminary.* You might have good private Christians without these: but surely you may also be good Christians with them, and being in possession of such acquisitions you will find your intelligent apprehension of Divine truth greatly cleared, your capacity of interpreting it greatly increased, and your openings and spheres of influence vastly multiplied and enlarged. It is not to be forgotten that the great man who was mainly instrumental in establishing the ancient Church, was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians;" that the most successful preacher in the early Church was brought up in a great city and was conversant with the literature of the most learned people in the old world. We live in an age of advancing knowledge in which all become acquainted with the elements of science, history and art; and those who lead and guide the intelligence of the times must themselves go before.

---

* This paper was delivered as an address before the graduating class of the German Reformed Theological Seminary at Lancaster, in May, and is published at their request.

Art. V.—EVOLUTION THEORIES AND THEOLOGY.*

BY PROF. J. S. STAHR, A. M, LANCASTER, PA.

There was a time, and not very long ago, before sufficient progress had been made in the various departments of Natural Science to give us correct ideas of the constitution of the world and the organization of nature, when Theology and Natural Science never came in conflict. Theologians, moving in their own sphere, rested in peace and security, never dreaming that there could be any discrepancy or contradiction between the views which they held in regard to the origin and development of the world, (which they also believed were taught in the Bible), and the facts of Natural Science as they came to light from time to time. But when Astronomy had advanced far enough to show that the form and size of the earth and its relation to the other heavenly bodies were all different from what they had supposed; when Geology showed that the earth had a history of its formation treasured up in its own bosom; and when it was found that this history seemed to teach facts not in harmony with received tradition, or even with the literal statements of the Bible, the aspect of things changed. On the one hand science was opposed and decried in some quarters, whilst in others attempts were made to reconcile the facts or conclusions of Natural Science with the statements of the Bible. On the other hand there were not wanting among the votaries of science those who took pleasure in raising objections (whether well founded or not) both against the Bible and the principles of our holy religion. Thus a conflict between Natural Science and Theology originated which has not only continued to the present time, but has even extended over a wider area than at first, and has really become one of the vital questions of the day.

* Substance of an address delivered before the students of Franklin and Marshall College, at the opening of the Spring Term, 1872.

After it was found that the earth is not a mechanical production as had been taken for granted by many; that the creation of the world was not a mechanical work finished at one sitting, but rather brought about by the operation of Law during long periods, *ages* of time; it was natural to go a step farther and inquire whether it is not probable that living creatures were subject to a similar process, developing from a lower to a higher plane; that all the different forms of vegetable and animal life are genetically connected and related; that the higher and later forms were in some way derived from some lower and earlier form or forms. This gives us the fundamental thought of what are usually called EvolutionTheories or Development Theories.

There are some students of natural science who would thus dispense with the idea of creation altogether, expressing what we call *nature* in a formula somewhat like this: Matter is eternal: There are two kinds or rather states of matter: crystalline and colloid matter. Under certain favorable circumstances crystalline matter may become colloid matter or *protoplasm;* this produces the nucleated cell, and thus we get a living organism. Starting now with this, one form of life is derived from another, branching into the vegetable and animal kingdoms, rising through their various grades until we reach man, who, with body and soul, affections, intelligence and will, is thus evolved from the lower forms of life.

But, after all, there are very few who would accept such bald materialism as that. Scientific men (using the term as applied to *natural* science), if asked, would generally admit the existence of a Creator and an original creation. They take the position however that their religious belief and their science are altogether independent of each other. The question of original immediate creation, they say, is one with which they have nothing to do. Taking creation for granted, commencing with existent matter and life in some rudimentary form,* they proceed to deal with the derivation or evolution of the higher forms of life, or *derivative creation.* Herbert Spencer and his

* Many now believe in spontaneous generation, or Darwin's theory of pangenesis.

school speak dogmatically of a Creator as unknowable and unthinkable. But generally belief in God, and Christianity is left an open question. It is important therefore in taking a calm view of our subject, not so much to determine what this or that scientific adept teaches or believes in regard to Theology, as to see what is the general tendency of the science of the day. In endeavoring to do this, in our examination and classification of the different theories, we shall freely use such material as we have at hand for the purpose.

It is of course admitted on all sides that in general *individuals* are derived by ordinary generation from others that are like them, or, as some would say, from others of the *same species*. But as soon as we come to the species, we find a difference of opinion. What is a species? Where do species come from? These are vexed questions, and involve the whole subject at issue. Buffon's definition, a species is a constant succession of individuals similar to, and capable of reproducing one another, at once takes for granted that the species are permanent, and therefore rejected by evolutionists. Again, if we establish no such limits, if the species is supposed to be determined by mere likeness or similarity of structure our definition becomes so vague that we lose the line of demarkation which should separate one species from another. Let us try to classify the various theories proposed to account for the origin of species.

It is maintained on the one hand that the type of a species is permanent, and that the various individuals comprehended in it can have sprung *only* from others like them so far as the general type is concerned. According to this view we need an *independent creation* for every species—the old view which has hitherto prevailed, and which is still advocated by men like Agassiz, who maintains that each species not only had an independent origin, but also that it originated in a definite, circumscribed locality. There are two ways in which independent creations may have taken place: 1st, By the creation of adults, so beautifully described by Milton in Paradise Lost, Book vii. 2d, By the creation of eggs or germs—proposed by Swedenborg

(Worship and Love of God, Sec. 3). On the other hand it is maintained that the type of a species itself may change; either gradually, deviating farther and farther from the original under the influence of modifying circumstances until a new species is produced, or the type may suddenly change, so that the new species appears at once under the operation of some innate, internal law. In the former case we obtain new species through intermediate varieties; in the latter, no such varieties occur: we pass immediately from one species to another.

There may be two kinds of gradual variation: 1st, Transmutation—Lamarck's theory, according to which even in a single individual a change of structure takes place in the animal so that it can adapt itself to different conditions or surroundings. 2d Natural Selection, the theory proposed by Darwin and Wallace independently about the same time. Assuming sudden variations we have again two different theories: 1st, Ordinary Genesis in which the offspring differs materially from either parent, such variation being dependent on some occult, innate law. Theories involving this principle have been proposed by the author of "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," Prof. Parsons of Harvard, Prof. Owen, and Prof. Mivart, which although they differ in some respects, all come under this head. 2d, Parthenogenesis—Virgin Birth (on the principle of *gemmiparous* or *fissiparous reproduction*, exhibiting the phenomena of *alternate generation*), proposed by Ferris. Besides these there are various modifications of one or more of the foregoing theories, as for instance the hypothesis of "Acceleration and Retardation" proposed by Prof. Cope which has been received with much favor by scientific men.

It appears thus that the hypothesis of Natural Selection, or the "Darwinian Theory" as it is often called, is not synomymous with *evolution* in general. We must carefully distinguish between the two; one is a particular, a subordinate of the other. Many scientific men reject Darwin's particular hypothesis, whilst at the same time they firmly believe in some form of evolution which, if it does not derive all living beings from one primary form of life, nevertheless makes room for the passing

over of one species into another, and affords wider scope for variation in the general type than has been hitherto allowed.

As the Darwinian Theory has attracted a great deal of attention, and is regarded on all sides as one of the greatest and most important scientific productions of our century, it may be well to state its fundamental principles as briefly as we can.*

1. Individuals have a tendency to increase by natural propagation in a geometrical ratio, whilst the actual number remains very nearly, indeed in most cases almost exactly, the same.

2. Hence there is necessarily a struggle for existence among those which compete for food, and endeavor to escape death.

3. The fittest survive; that is, those die which are least fitted to maintain their existence.

4. There is a hereditary transmission to the offspring of the general likeness of the parents.

5. We find however individual differences among all.

6. There is a universal and unceasing change of external conditions.

7. In like manner there are changes of organic forms to keep them in harmony with the changed conditions; and as the changes of condition are permanent in the sense that they do not revert back to identical previous conditions, the changes of organic forms must be in the same sense permanent, and thus originate species.

In order that these principles may work out their result, it is necessary to give them an unlimited period of time, a period practically infinite. In the struggle for life, now, whenever an accidental variation proves advantageous, the individual to which it belongs is preserved by it, thus it is transmitted to another perhaps in an intensified form from generation to generation, necessarily requiring also other changes of structure to preserve the harmony of the organism. Injurious or worthless variations, however, hinder their possessors; hence they rapidly die out and disappear. Thus we rise continually from lower

---

* From Mivart, "Nation," &c.

to higher forms of life until the most complicated structures are produced by this simple process of *natural selection.*

It is impossible as well as out of place to attempt in this connection anything like a full statement of the particular involved in the theory now under consideration. We can only suggest a few leading points, and keeping our main purpose in view, to show the bearing of these evolution theories on Theology, it may be well to state some of the arguments in favor of Darwin's views, as well as to bring forward some of the principal objections, in order that we may see how the question stands at the present time.

1. The argument of antecedent probability and analogy. God never works magically, but always in regular, progressive order. Thus the earth was formed, the world created, and thus He also works in His kingdom of grace. We might therefore naturally expect that living beings would be developed in the same way.

2. Examples of varieties artificially produced. Many different varieties of cultivated roses are derived from the same original stock. The same is true of fruit, different kinds of strawberries, cherries and apples. So also of animals under domestication. Different breeds of horses, cattle, sheep, *etc.*

3. Referring to the geological record we find that life appeared first upon the earth in its simplest, most elementary forms, first in the vegetable, then in the animal kingdom. Starting in this way we find an advance all along, ascending to more complicated forms until we come to the age of man.

4. In addition to this we actually find certain intermediate or transitional forms. Animals and plants approach each other so closely in the Zoophytes that it is very difficult if not impossible to draw the dividing line between the two kingdoms. Some of the earlier fishes were very unfishlike, bearing a striking resemblance to reptiles. Some of the earlier birds had vertebrated tails like serpents, forming a connecting link between reptiles and birds.

5. The presence of rudimentary structures or organs which serve no useful purpose whatever so far as we know. Such are the mammillary glands in males, rudimentary wings in species

that never use them, *etc.* These structures are best accounted for by supposing that they were of use to some progenitor of the particular animal that now has them, and when the conditions of life changed and these organs ceased to be useful, they dwindled away into mere traces or rudiments.

6. Homology—Similarity of structure in different organs, or derivation of different organs from the same fundamental form. As in plants all the different parts are only modifications of root, stem and leaves, all the flower organs and the fruit, for example, being only modified leaves, so in animals the different members are constructed on the same plan; in the vertebrates, *e. g.*, the different bones of the head, arm, *etc.*, are only modified vertebræ. In the same way there is a striking resemblance between the corresponding organs in different individuals between the arm of an ape, the fore-leg of a bear, the wing of a bird, and the fin or paddle of a whale. All this shows close relationship.

7. Mimicry, striking resemblance between animals widely different, or between animals and certain plants. Insects and other little animals are often found that look so much like a blade of grass, a leaf or other inanimate object that they are not easily distinguished at first sight. For example the leaf butterfly, walking-leaf insect, *etc.* The theory accounts for these features by supposing that accidental resemblances of this kind at first enabled the fortunate possessors to escape from their pursuers, and they were thus transmitted with additions.

On the other hand there are grave difficulties in the way, which Darwinians themselves must admit, and which to us seem insurmountable.

1. Although Geology teaches that long periods of time intervened between the creation of the earth and the creation of man (a fact not contradicted by the Bible), we are shut up to the fact that this *past time must have a limit.* "Sir William Thomson has lately advanced arguments from three distinct lines of inquiry, and agreeing in one approximate result. The three lines of inquiry were: 1st, The action of the tides upon the earth's relation; 2d, The probable length of time during which the sun has illuminated this planet; and 3d, The tempera-

ture of the interior of the earth. Result: The existing state of things or life on the earth must be limited within some such period of past time as one hundred million years."* This calculation may not be correct; but no one has yet tried to show that it is incorrect. At all events the time which Physics and Astronomy allow for the existence of the earth is entirely too short to account for the origin of the different species of living beings by means of slow, gradual, accidental variations in the type, as Darwin's hypothesis supposes. Taking as a standard the stage of organization and development of the various species at the close of the Silurian age, observing how much progress has been made since that time, say approximately in 25,000,000 years which geologists say were needed to deposit the different strata of rock, and going back then to the simplest forms of life with which we are acquainted, the time needed between such beginning and the Silurian age would be one hundred times as great as between the Silurian age and the present time. This would amount only to a little more than two billion, five hundred million years!

2. Darwin errs when he attributes to blind chance in the form of *natural selection* the same results as follow from man's intelligent selection and influence in forming *varieties*. Wherever a variation occurs, however produced, it is always apt to be lost in the next generation on account of the strong tendency manifested in all such cases to revert to the original type. Now where man chooses the individuals which are to propagate the species and surrounds them with favorable conditions, he can preserve such peculiarities as have appeared, or change them at will. But according to the theory there are only a few favored individuals which have the peculiarities that are to be transmitted, and there are therefore hundreds, yea thousands of chances against these favored ones mating together. The peculiarities would thus rapidly diminish, and be completely lost in a few generations.

3. The geological record is against the theory, for although

* Mivart.

we find some transitional forms, a great many are wanting; and if such forms had really existed, there is no reason why their fossils should not be preserved. Darwin acknowledges this difficulty.

4. The transitional forms that occur, sometimes run in opposition to the theory. Some of the earlier fishes have striking reptilian features, and are altogether of higher type than some of the later forms into which they gradually pass over. Here there were as yet no reptiles from which the fishes could be derived. Neither can it be shown that there is any direct connection between fishes and reptiles in the other direction.—All along the first geological specimen, if not one of the highest, is generally of an intermediate or comprehensive type which branches out in two directions, being followed both by higher and lower forms. According to the theory the movement ought always to be from below upward, from lower to higher forms.

5. Facts of homology and mimicry are not sufficient to prove the case. Whilst the theory will account for many phenomena of this kind, there are others on which it has no bearing whatever. Here it is necessary to show not what might be, but what really is the case, and the reasoning of Darwinians frequently involves a pitiful begging of the question. Hence Agassiz pronounces the theory "a scientific mistake, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its methods and mischievous in its tendency."

6. The theory does not account for "incipient structures, that is, for the beginning of those features, which, although very useful in their fully developed form, are not useful at first." The trunk of an elephant may serve as useful a purpose as anybody else's trunk does its owner; but it is not easy to see what good it did the elephant's great-great great-grand-father to have a nose just a *little* longer than any of his fellows,

Having stated so much, we will only say further that the verdict of the scientific world in regard to the theory is, that it has not been proven. Huxley adopts it only provisionally. Many others adopt some features whilst they reject others. There is no doubt a general tendency among scientific men towards some form of evolution or development theory, whilst

there is much opposition to Darwinism pure and simple. Darwin himself has been obliged to shift his position, inasmuch as he has introduced a new principle, what he calls sexual selection, to account for a series of phenomena which were before altogether inexplicable by the theory.

What makes this subject very important in a theological point of view is its supposed bearing on the origin of man. But the origin of man does not necessarily depend on the truth or falsity of this theory. Darwin, as is well known, extends the theory so far as to include man, making the latter nothing more than an improved gorilla, Wallace, however, takes the opposite view, maintaining that it is impossible to explain the origin either of man's bodily organs, or of his higher nature.

If we grant that man, with body, soul, and spirit (according to our common terminology) is *only* the sublimation of the lower forms of life, if we deny to him spirit breathed into him by the Almighty Creator, then of course we are done at once with religion and belief in God. We are hopelessly consigned to the realm of infidelity and materialism. But as long as we hold on to spirit as something distinct from matter, something that matter cannot give or generate, as long as we place man not only at the head of the world, but also raise him far above the lower world in consequence of a distinctive endowment from heaven, we still have an anchor that will hold our frail bark, there is a secure haven where our spirits, tossed to and fro by the storms of skepticism, may find refuge. St. George Mivart thinks there is nothing either in the theory of evolution, or even in spontaneous generation that will, if properly viewed, conflict with genuine, orthodox Christianity. Suppose we believe that the higher forms of life have in some way been derived from lower forms under the guidance and control of natural law: where does natural law come from? If the Creator made matter originally and gave it powers and properties which of themselves are capable of producing all the phenomena of life, are His wisdom and power any less in this case than when we suppose that He created or creates every single species separate and alone? There is force in this reasoning, but it sunders the

law from the Creator, and leaves us at best at the mercy of cold deism, which is little better than atheism itself. We grant of course the operation of natural law in the development of the world. But we deny that it works blindly or by chance. And it seems to us, as it is not difficult to recognize a *plan* in the organization of the world, a tendency in the development of the different forms of life toward *man*, whose type is really *the* type of nature, so there ought to be no difficulty in recognizing an *immanent God* whose hand guides and controls the whole world, working not in opposition to, but in connection and harmony with natural law. Many naturalists are beginning to realize this in some degree, and in many quarters the watch-word prevails: "No force without mind back of it." True, we say; but here we must be careful not to identify mind and force, Deity and natural law; or we are again at the mercy of blind fatality, hopelessly entangled in the meshes of pantheism.

Natural Science, we are told, necessarily tends towards skepticism and infidelity. That depends upon the way in which it is studied, and the stand point from which the student enters upon his work. It would be strange if the works of God would necessarily lead us away from God, if the creature would draw us away from the Creator. But if we persistently ignore, or at least forget the Creator, begin below by induction, adhere only to tangible facts, stifle our deepest intuitions, and believe only what we can see, we need not wonder at the skeptical frame of mind which we cultivate, nor be surprised if we turn out infidels. On the other hand theologians, or those who call themselves theologians, help to widen the chasm which opens so readily. There is too much disposition on the part of these self-constituted champions of orthodoxy to oppose new views simply because they are new and do not square with received traditions. They are all wrong, in opposition to the Bible, *etc.* After a few years these views are "all right," and we are then refreshed with learned treatises to prove that they are *not* in opposition to the Bible, and that even the early Church fathers held them. This is a wrong mode of procedure, and serves only to bring reproach upon the cause which it was designed to

aid. Let the Bible be used for what it was intended as the record of God's revelation, a fountain of truth in the religious sphere, and not as a scientific treatise, or even a book whose statements of facts are made in scientific language, or in any form of speech different from the current forms and opinions of the ages in which the different writers lived. On the other hand let naturalists remain in their sphere, and be careful how they dogmatize or tamper with sacred things. Thus natural science and theology will both accomplish their mission; and although science can never become religion, the lower sphere cannot rise into the higher, religion can, thank God, reach over into science as into every other natural sphere, and sanctify this as it sanctifies every other human interest. And when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ, we shall no longer see through a glass darkly, but face to face; and all the works of creation shall glorify their Creator.

ART. VI.—THE POSITION OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN RELATION TO CALVINISM.

THE position of the German Reformed Church must be interpreted by the system of truth taught in the Heidelberg Catechism. That Catechism was its sole standard in the first organization and founding of the Church in the Palatinate. It is proper, also, of course, to consider the history of the German Reformed Church, and also that of the Reformed Church at large, in studying our subject. This we propose to do, so far as our space will allow, in the present article.

By Calvinism, as the word is used in this article, we mean, not what was meant by it during the Reformation, when it designated a certain theory of the Sacraments, as distinguished from the Lutheran theory; but what is understood by the word in more modern times, as referring to a certain theory in regard to the divine decrees, or predestination. During the Reforma-

tion, Calvin's name became specially prominent as a leading advocate of that view of the Lord's Supper which stands between Zwinglianism and Lutheranism. In distinction from the Zwinglian theory, that the Lord's Supper is a mere commemoration of the sufferings and death of Christ, Calvin held to a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. In distinction from the Lutheran view, that the body and blood of Christ are received orally, and by unbelievers as well as believers, he taught that the real presence was at the same time a spiritual presence, that is, in the sphere of the Spirit, and that the body and blood are received by faith, and by believers only. This, in brief, was the Calvinistic theory of the Sacrament, and to be a Calvinist, or a crypto-Calvinist, was to hold either openly or secretly this sacramental theory.

But Calvinism in later times came to mean something very different. It came to designate a theological system in which Calvin's view of predestination was the ruling principle. What in the Reformation was held both by Reformed and Lutheran, by Luther and Zwingli as well as Calvin, viz.: the doctrine of predestination, was made the centre of a system, so that all other doctrines took their meaning from it. Modern Calvinism makes the doctrine of the divine decrees central in its system.

What we wish to consider now is, the relation of the Heidelberg Catechism to this system, as it came to be developed subsequently to the Reformation, particularly in the Synod of Dort, and the Westminster Assembly. We hear it sometimes said, that the Heidelberg Catechism is a Calvinistic Confession, meaning by this, Calvinistic in the modern sense, and that its teachings are therefore to be interpreted from the Calvinistic stand-point. Such a judgment involves an anachronism, for the Heidelberg Catechism was produced before Calvinism, in the sense now used, came to its expression as a system. It may, indeed be said, that it was in the Catechism, and in the Reformed teaching generally from the beginning, and therefore, as the tree is to be judged by its fruits, it is legitimate to judge the Heidelberg Catechism by those Confessions in which, as is supposed, its system came to full perfection. We believe that

a fair examination of our subject, and of the history connected with it, will show that this is altogether a wrong view, a mere assumption with nothing to support it.

If we consider, first of all, the nature of the Reformed faith as it existed previous to the formation of the Heidelberg Catechism, in Zwingli and the Swiss reformation, or in Calvin, it is clear, that it was distinguished from Lutheranism, not specially by its doctrine of the divine decrees, but rather, as has been said, by its doctrine of the sacraments. There was, at first, no question raised as to the difference between Luther and the Reformed theologians on this subject. Luther himself was as strict a predestinarian as any one. The whole Protestant position, in that it revived Augustinianism, in the way of emphasizing the antithesis between nature and grace, holding up man's inability and the power of grace, over against the Pelagianizing tendencies of the Roman Church, brought forward the doctrine of predestination. But this was by no means regarded as central in the Christian system. It was a doctrine among other doctrines, a truth among other truths, and on this account it did not become a dividing question between Lutheran and Reformed.

With Calvin himself it was held in equipoise by his view of the Church and the Holy Sacraments. His abstract, metaphysical view of the decrees of God was complemented by his view of the historical character of Christianity. The Church, and the acts and ordinances of the Church, were grace-bearing. The strong language, often quoted, which he uses in reference to the visible Church, is sufficient to show this. He says,* "But, as our present design is to treat of the *visible* Church, we may learn, even from the title of *mother*, how useful and even necessary it is for us to know her; since there is no other way of entrance into life, unless we are conceived by her, born of her, nourished at her breast, and continually preserved under her care and government till we are divested of this mortal flesh, and 'become like the angels.' . . . . It is also to be re-

* Institutes, Book IV., Chap. iv.

marked, that out of her bosom there can be no hope of remission of sins, or any salvation, etc." It is true, that there is often a conflict, and even a contradiction, in Calvin's teaching on the grace-bearing character of the Church, and the decree of predestination in the metaphysical sense, as there is, indeed, in the Calvinism of our own times. While he must teach that all who are properly baptized are brought into covenant relations with God, yet, how to reconcile this with the secret decree of God, according to which, only, men are called and chosen to eternal life, presents a difficulty. The difficulty did not lead Calvin, however, to renounce his Church views, as is done often by a more modern Calvinism.

If it be said, that the principles of Augustine in regard to nature and grace, which were held by the Reformers, necessitate the theory of predestination, and that in the two-fold sense of election and reprobation, we may say of them what Dr. Schaff (Church Hist., Vol. II., p. 853) says of Augustine: "It was a noble inconsistency which kept Augustine from the more stringent and speculative system of supralapsarianism; his deep moral convictions revolted against making any allowance for sin by tracing its origin to the divine will, and by his peculiar view of the inseparable connection between Adam and the race, he could make every man, as it were, individually responsible for the fall of Adam." It was a noble inconsistency in the Reformers of the 16th century, that they subordinated their theory of the divine decree to the great principles of redemption in its historical, concrete form.

Leaving the teachings of the Reformers generally, let us examine briefly the position of the Heidelberg Catechism itself on this subject. It is not difficult to see that the Catechism is not a Calvinistic symbol, in the sense of modern Calvinism. There is nothing in the circumstances connected with the formation of the Catechism that would lead us to expect it to be a Calvinistic symbol, but much to lead us to a different expectation. It is true that one of the framers of the Catechism was a disciple of Calvin, but we have seen already that Calvin's own system was much different from the later Calvinistic sys-

tem. The Church in the Palatinate had been Lutheran, or, at least, it was seeking to form itself amidst the ferment awakened by the sacramentarian controversy. The main question to be settled, was to find such a position as would be able to unite the conflicting elements in the Palatinate on a positive basis. The Arminian controversy had not yet arisen. There was no dispute specially in regard to the divine decrees. While, therefore, the fact that one of the framers of the Catechism was a disciple of Calvin might lead us to expect that the Catechism would contain somewhere his views on predestination, yet there is nothing in the circumstances that would naturally lead to making these views in any way central.

In looking at the Catechism itself we are at once confronted with a system which rests rather in historical than in speculative metaphysical Christianity. It opens with a recognition of the historical status of the baptized member of the Church, not attempting to go back of this to find the origin of the believer's calling in an abstract, divine decree. "What is thy only comfort in life and in death?" This is the opening question. The individual addressed is one having a status in the Church by baptism. He stands in the bosom of the saving order of life, in the communion of God's people. This standing proceeds from the deliverance from sin and death which was procured by Jesus Christ, who purchased us with His precious blood. This deliverance belongs to the catechumen by virtue of his standing in the communion of the Church, and he is now to make it a personal possession by coming to a consciousness of his sin and misery by natural birth, and, at the same time, an acceptance by faith of the salvation purchased by Christ.

In all this we have an opening or introduction of a very different kind from that found, for instance, in the Confession of the Westminster Assembly, or in the Articles of the Synod of Dort. It is an opening which looks at Christianity as historical, it treats the subject as concrete, not abstract; in short one can feel that it starts from a churchly, and not a metaphysical, stand-point. Of course, we are not here treating at all of the merits of the subject. We are not raising the question whether

there is a decree of election, and a decree of reprobation, lying back of all history. Whether there is, or is not, is no matter here. The point we make is that the Heidelberg Catechism does not start with an inquiry on this point, but regards the baptized catechumen as a child of grace, by reason of his standing in the communion of God's people through baptism.

In treating of the fall, again, the Catechism proceeds from the historical stand-point. Sin proceeds, it tells us, from the fall and disobedience of our first parents in Paradise, hence our *nature* has become so corrupt that we are inapt, disinclined, to all good, and inclined to all wickedness. Here, also, there is no inquiry as to any other explanation of sin, than that which places it in the human will. God may or may not have decreed the fall of man, in order to make room for the higher revelation of His grace in the redemption of the world, according to the supralapsarians, but that question is not raised here. And this, again, is sufficient to show that the doctrine of the decrees is not the central or controlling principle in the Catechism.

Neither is there any theory of outward imputation introduced. Nothing is said about a covenant which God made with Adam, according to which He imputes guilt to every descendant of Adam, by reason of Adam's sin. It is the old Augustinian view of the fall, rather, that is presented in the Catechism, according to which the race is viewed as one organism, so that when the head becomes sinful, all the members become possessors and sharers of the sinful life. Here, again, the subject is treated historically, not metaphysically. How is it, when we come to consider the salvation of man, and especially the question whether all men are saved in Christ as they die in Adam? Surely, if there is any place where the doctrine of predestination and election would naturally be asserted in a Calvinistic symbol, it is here. The Catechism implies that redemption is universal in its provisions—it is as broad as the fall. The fall was as wide-reaching as the organism of humanity,—redemption is equally for the race. But while it is sufficient for all, will all accept of it and be saved? This is

the turning-point. The Catechism in answer to the question, "*Are all men, then, as they perished in Adam, saved by Christ?*" replies, "No; only those who are ingrafted into Him, and receive all His benefits by a true faith." This is the only particularism taught in the Catechism. It avoids the metaphysical question as to the reason why some accept the provisions of grace, and others do not, and points to the historical fact, the condition necessary to salvation. As man falls in Adam, and perishes because he is a member of a fallen race, so in order to be saved he must become a member of Christ, be ingrafted into Him, and be a living member of the living vine —receive all His benefits by a true faith. The Catechism does not assert or deny anything in regard to the reason why some are saved and others not, as this may be conceived to lie back of the fact of regeneration; and just because it does not, we may infer that the Calvinistic theory of election did not rule its order here. The authors may have held it, and those now who adopt the teachings of the Catechism, may hold it, but it does not come forward at this point in the Catechism where, especially, we would look for it.

Why it does not appear here is, no doubt, because the Catechism is considering redemption from another stand-point. It regards it as a life fact, as an organic, moving, quickening power, and not as a metaphysical theory or process. Hence the Catechism is consistent with its own course of treatment. It started out, not with a metaphysical inquiry, but a fact of life; it must continue on from the same stand-point with which it started out.

The next place in the Catechism, where we are to look for its position in relation to Calvinism, is the question in regard to the Church. It is here asserted, "that the Son of God, from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends, and preserves to Himself, by His Spirit and Word, out of the whole human race, a Church chosen to everlasting life, agreeing in true faith; and that I am, and forever shall remain, a living member thereof." There is no reference here to any decrees going before the work of Christ. What predestination

there may be involved here, is, not abstract, but concrete. It is the divine will in Christ. Indeed, it is a matter of very little concern for our subject, how much predestination there is, or is not, here, for we are not to look, in this question on one of the last articles of the Creed, for the moulding principle of the Catechism. But still it is clear that this language is not the language of the Calvinism of modern times. Who could not say that it is Christ who gathers, defends, and preserves His Church?

In regard to the last clause, "that I am, and forever shall remain, a living member thereof," we have in a certain way the perseverance of the saints, but it is expressed in such way that no sincere believer could say aught else. It is not said from an objective stand-point, as though another should say it of the catechumen, but the catechumen utters it as his own belief. No sincere believer, we repeat, can utter any other faith in regard to himself. But this is a very different thing from holding, as an abstract proposition, that there is a divine decree that he cannot fall from grace, and basing his faith in his own perseverance on this. He cannot believe that he is a living member of the Church at all, without embracing the faith that he will remain steadfast and constant unto the end. But the result here clearly is determined by his remaining in this faith. This may be fixed by a decree, or it may not be fixed in that way. That point again is not raised. We have here, therefore, only another instance of the wisdom of the Catechism, in not going out of its regular course to discuss the metaphysical question of the divine decrees.

These are the only places in the Catechism, where the subject of predestination is at all touched. In any case, there is no trace of any thing like a double decree of election and reprobation. On this point there is no difference of opinion. All among us, who have written on the subject, agree on the conclusion to which we have arrived, as to the general position of the Catechism in reference to the subject under consideration.

In all that we have now said in regard to the position of the Heidelberg Catechism, it must not be understood that we desire

to rule out from that symbol all Calvinistic elements. Calvinism certainly includes a great truth, and it is this great truth that has given strength to that system, and attracted to it some of the deepest thinkers in theological science. But the greatness of the Catechism reveals itself, in the manner it subordinates this great truth of God's sovereignty, to a still greater system of faith based on the *Apostles' Creed.* In this apostolic symbol Christ is the central object of faith. When human reason and metaphysical inquiry would say, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us,"—let us see and measure the sovereignty of God, it replies, "He that hath seen Christ, the Revealer, hath seen the Father, and the great doctrine of the divine sovereignty must be found and studied in the Son who came into the world to do the Father's will."

Let us now turn to the history of the Reformed Church, as it bears upon our subject, and see whether its legitimate development resulted in elevating Calvinism into a governing principle, or left it as the Catechism did, in its proper subordinate position in the Christian system.

After the first period of the Reformation, the theological activity of the Reformed Church of Germany, seems to have been transferred to Holland. During the conflicts that arose in the Palatinate, where persecution rolled over the land like angry billows, and the unsettled condition of Germany, the universities of the Netherlands rose into prominence, and became the centres of intense literary activity. Here the Heidelberg Catechism was received with the greatest favor, and soon became the established book of instruction in the churches. This fact is sufficient to show that the theologians regarded it as constructed in the interest of Calvinism, as over against Pelagianism, or Arminianism, soon to rise in warfare against it.

An event soon occurred, however, which led to an enlargement of the Confession of Holland, which it is necessary now to consider in its relation to the Heidelberg Catechism. We refer to the assembling of the famous Synod of Dort.

The occasion for the calling of this Synod was the dispute that had arisen between the Arminians or Remonstrants and

Contra-remonstrants, a dispute which involved not only religious, but also political questions. Simon Episcopius, John v. Oldenbarneveld, and Hugo de Groot, were the leaders of the Arminian party, and Prince Moritz, of Orange, with the Calvinistic theologians headed the opposite party. The result was the calling of a national Synod to settle the disputes of the Netherland churches. This Synod, however, aimed to be something of an œcumenical Reformed Synod, and accordingly invitations were sent to the Reformed churches of Switzerland, Scotland, England, Germany, and France. Many of the foreign churches, however, sent no delegates, and the authority of the Synod failed to attain to anything more than national importance, as we shall presently see.

The result of the deliberations of this Synod was the endorsement of the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession, and the production of what are known as The Articles of the Synod of Dort, touching the five points of Calvinism. The question is, whether the Heidelberg Catechism is to be interpreted in the light of these new articles, or whether these articles stand before us as even of co-ordinate authority with the Catechism for the German Reformed Church.

We are told by Dr. Heppe that the German Reformed theologians not only expressed their dissent from the Dort doctrine of election, but subsequently impugned the authority of the Synod. "The adoption of these *Canones* must be considered as that act by which the Church of Holland renounced the evangelical unionism and Philipism of the *Conf. Helvet.*, and fixed its high and rigid predestinarianism." So also Dr. Dorner, in his History of Protestant Theology, asserts that the "predestinarian aspect of the Reformed system never attained unquestioned authority." There was a reaction against the doctrine of particularism in the counsel of salvation within the Reformed Church itself. "This was the case in Holland, France and England successively, and at last, in the eighteenth century, in Switzerland also, where, by means of Heidegger's *Form. Cons. Helvet.*, the attempt was made, even in 1675, to decide as far as possible against it. The *Confessio Sigismundi*,

1613, denies an absolute decree of individual reprobation, (*decretum reprobationis*), while, even after the Synod of Dort, the Reformed Hessian and Margraviate theologians for the most part went no further than to dwell upon unbelief as the cause of reprobation."

We think there is abundant evidence to show that the broad basis for the Reformed faith in the Heidelberg Catechism, was rather contracted during the narrow scholasticism of the 17th century, that there were loud and powerful protests against this dwarfing process, and that the tendency in the 18th and 19th centuries, amidst terrible struggles, has been to return to the broad, Catholic position of the Catechism, rather than to settle down upon the five points of Calvinism.

These protests came from France in the theology of the school of Saumur. *Amyraud* (Amyraldus) sought to find room for the universalism of grace beside the particularism of effective salvation. Though he involved himself in logical inconsistency, yet he was struggling to assert a great truth over against the extreme theory of Calvinism. So, also, *Placœus* sought to find a better theory, one more like that of the Heidelberg Catechism, when he advanced the view that we are guilty before God, because we are sinful, by virtue of our organic relation to Adam, over against the view of outward imputation. He, too, failed to maintain consistency in his system, and fell under the ban of the Synod of Charenton, 1645, but his effort reveals the undertone of protest against extreme Calvinism.

Still more significant was the rise of the Federal school under *Coccejus*. The effort of Coccejus was to find a principle of Scripture interpretation, by which the work of redemption could be viewed in its connected historical character, a principle that would organically unite the Old and New Testaments. This principle he found in the idea of the Covenant. The movement in revelation, from the beginning, is to be interpreted by the constitution of the covenant. The covenant is one in the Old and New Testaments, moving forward under the two dispensations. There is here an evident effort to find some

other principle than the abstract decree, an effort to get at the historical element in revelation, and so far it is a valid protest against abstract predestinarianism. It does, indeed, come short of the true central principle of all revelation which is to be found in Jesus Christ, but still it was a movement in the right direction, to escape the theory which makes the divine decree the central principle of theology. It looks towards the decree as concrete in the movement of revelation.

History now turns into the great philosophic currents, from Cartesianism through the systems of Leibnitz and Wolff, Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, to the new epoch starting in Schleiermacher. We cannot follow this grand struggle, in which German Rationalism rose to the surface, and was fought. The results are before us in the regenerated German theology of the present century. But it is clear, that in the Reformed Church of Germany, the theory of metaphysical Calvinism never came to be received as a ruling principle.

In England, the Calvinistic scheme was never received by the Episcopal Church, but it found expression in the Confession of the Westminster Assembly, and also in the Church of Scotland. The course of history certainly shows that Calvinism, in the modern sense, was only one of the elements of the life and faith of the Reformed Church, and where it succeeded in making itself the central, controlling principle, it came to be a one-sided development, and did not carry forward in its totality the deeper current of life that started in the original Reformed faith. Calvinism is certainly a tower of strength. It may deserve the high encomium passed upon it by Froude and others who have commended it, but it is not just the system contained in the Heidelberg Catechism, and we should consider it a loss and a calamity to exchange the latter for the former.

The more recent movements in the history of the Reformed Church, in its various branches, indicate a healthful tendency to subordinate the Calvinistic theory of the divine decrees to the historical and churchly character of Christianity. We may quote here the language of Dr. Bomberger, in his sermon be-

fore the Alumni of the Mercersburg Theological Seminary, delivered at Reading, in 1856. He says:

"Let us have it fairly understood, therefore, that it is not to Saybrook-platform Protestantism that we have plighted our faith and service, nor to the Protestantism of Hartford, Princeton, or New Brunswick, but to that form of it which is distinctly laid down in the standards already alluded to, and which may be easily ascertained by every candid inquirer. . . . . As a Church, therefore, or as an integral portion of the Evangelical Church, we have not only a right to maintain our distinctive character, but we are placed by Providence under special obligations to do so. We are not German Presbyterians, as we are sometimes called. There would be far more propriety in the Presbyterian Church calling itself English Reformed. The title Presbyterian relates to a comparatively unimportant characteristic of the true Church. But we are German Reformed. *The strong tendency of the more earnest theology of all the evangelical churches is towards those principles on which the German Reformed Church was originally founded, and for which she has from the first contended.* This is the case, with reference to what are usually styled the five distinctive points of Calvinism. The preaching of our day savors far less of the Institutes of Calvin, of the canons of Dort, or of the Westminster Confession, in reference to these points, than the mild, conciliatory, declarations of the Heidelberg Catechism. And so of the Sacraments."

There is a sharp edge here, in the references made to "our sister denominations," which may be accounted for by the strong attachment entertained by the writer, to the theology taught in our Theological Seminary. But the sentiments advanced are certainly correct. These Puritan and Presbyterian Confessions, *including the Canons of Dort*, are certainly a one-sided expression of the old Reformed faith, as expressed in so rich and catholic a spirit in the Heidelberg Catechism.

The subject which we have considered, may serve to throw light on our relation to the Calvinistic churches around us. We have much in common with the Presbyterian and the Dutch

Reformed Church. But it is clear that our own doctrinal position is more comprehensive than theirs, and better adapted to form a basis of union for the branches of the Reformed Church than theirs. Especially is there much in the history of both denominations to bind us to the Dutch Reformed Church. But we would consider it a great calamity, if we should think for a moment of giving up our broad, catholic position, for one that would give a one-sided expression of the old Reformed faith and life. Nothing would be gained, but much lost, by yielding to a temptation to gain some outward advantage, while at the same time we should surrender any of our internal strength of position.

The matter of union with the Dutch Reformed Church, thrust upon us somewhat hastily by the irregular action of both the Ohio Synod and the General Synod of the Dutch Church, may lead us at least to consider well our own position, and the mission set before us by Providence. There are pressing reasons why the branches of the Reformed Church, and we may say of the Protestant Church, should earnestly seek after unity. No Church in the country has felt the significance and necessity of this more than our own. But Protestant union is not a matter that can be brought into existence by legislation. It must be the result of a process of growth. We are surely under the moulding power of inward unity in the one common life of Christ, and this must tend to externalize itself. But the end cannot come before we are ripe for it.

The Dutch Reformed Church seems to be itself very much unsettled at this time. It is looking towards a new step of progress, and is giving signs of new life. It is considering with some interest and earnestness its theological position. But it is clear that this is as yet unsettled. They have not produced a theology which in any way defines their position. To produce one that will bring into inward reconciliation the Heidelberg Catechism and the Articles of the Synod of Dort, would go far to remove some of the internal difficulties in the way of union, but this we regard as a very difficult task.

It may, indeed, be said that the demands of the times

are such that we cannot wait for union until all doctrinal differences are settled between the churches, and we agree with this remark. Our church has plead for some broader doctrinal position, that may include in it certain differences. We believe that the doctrinal differences between many of our Protestant churches, are not sufficient to keep them apart. But to come to this conclusion intelligently, there must be some growth and widening in the faith of each of the churches concerned, so as to be able to settle on some Creed in a positive way, otherwise the union would be a mere alliance, negative in its character, and liable at any time to be broken, and leave the parties more widely sundered than ever.

We shall hail with heartfelt pleasure any movements that shall bring the question of Church unity, in its true merits, before our American churches, and we shall lend them our hearty co-operation. But any hasty, and especially irregular action is likely to bring injury upon the cause, rather than promote it. From the proceedings of the Reformed (Dutch) Synod, we see they have appointed a committee to consider whether the way is open for them to effect a union with the Presbyterian Church, South. In proportion as they lay stress on the Articles of Dort, they are drawn to the Presbyterian Church. It is yet a question whether these Articles, or the Heidelberg Catechism will prove for them of greater authority. At any rate, let us hope that these overtures in different directions, will lead to some good results.

Art. VII.—THE PROPHETIC OFFICE OF CHRIST.

FROM HARBAUGH'S DOGMATIK.

As Christ did not unite Himself abruptly and arbitrarily with humanity, but came by preparatory mediations, and as there was that in humanity which looked toward Him, and needed Him; so His prophetic activity does not break in abruptly into the sphere of life. It takes hold of, and bases itself upon something that looks to it, and thus comes to take up, fulfill, and perfect.

Thus we find, even in the lower orders of creation, a faint type, foreshadowing, and prophecy, of the *prophetic* in Christ. The whole order of the world looks up to Him for its true light, as all look up to Adam as its crown or flower. The instincts of plants and animals have in them something of presage,—foreshadowing. Their life projects itself beyond itself, and ahead of itself—has some sense of its own future workings in the present of its life. Every organic thing is necessarily prophetic. Its present principial life foreshadows its future, and the future of it is ever active in the germinal present. In man we find, and may designate, the successive and progressive stages of the prophetic want, ever foreshadowing with more and more clearness, the prophetic life, as brought into our nature by Christ, in its absolute and highest form. It manifests itself:

1. In man's life. It has the aptitude for going ever beyond itself. His life ever struggles to get beyond its limitations. His present life ever bends forward into the future. He has the power of feeling, in the way of presentiment, that which is to come. Hence, his present life ever shapes itself, with some reference to the future. In a word, man's life is a prophecy.

2. This feeling, or presentiment, does not remain mere dark, instinctive foreshadowing. Man is enabled, in some degree, to illuminate it by the powers and activities of mind. As his life

is involved, in a degree, in the same general flow of the world of which he is a part, he is enabled to look into his own future by following the laws of cause and effect. He is enabled to foresee probable results, by observing the course of events in which his own life is more or less involved. In other words, the mind, in the operations of its own laws, is prophetic. All knowing, as it runs in the course of human history, is in some sense a fore-knowing. Man's connection with the world of history, makes it possible for his mind to reach forward, as well as backward, and around him.

3. The spirit of man carries in itself a consciousness relating to his future destiny, as truly as it does of its origin in the past, and of its present relations. Self-consciousness requires the objective relation to time, as well as space. We can no more cut off in him his necessary bent toward the future, than we can toward the past. It is not merely reflected in his soul; it is a real constituent of it. Faith is the substance—substantiation—of things hoped for, (Heb. xi. 1). But there is the aptitude of faith in man. This aptitude is raised by Christianity. Though it does not pass over into Christian faith, it has something of its forward-reaching nature. Something of that which we are going to, something of what we are to become and be, is ever also in us, as part of our own consciousness.

> "Hence, in a season of calm weather,
> Though inland far we be,
> Our souls have sight of that immortal sea,
> Which brought us hither,—
> Can in a moment travel thither,
> And see the children sport upon the shore,
> And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore."
>
> —*Wordsworth.*

This peculiar nature of our humanity is attested and illustrated by the phenomena that result from it in heathen life. In the bosom of heathenism, this "earnest expectation," this "groaning and travailing" in the nature of man, has ever found actual embodiment. The heathen *μάντις*, though we may

allow that his ecstatic intoxication was not the sole effect of burning drugs, but really an inspiration from a lower spiritual world, still shows their sense of the capacity of man for foretelling, (Acts xvi. 16). Their oracles, their astrology, their signs in the entrails of animals, in the flight of birds, in the lines of the hand, and in the sediment of cups,—all this is evidence of the prophetic impulse, however perverted, debased, and even dæmonized. It witnesses to the prophetic capacity and faculty in our nature. The foretelling faculty manifested itself in even a higher form among them, in the activities of their sages and poets. Whatever of Satanic power and influence we may associate with these prophetic phenomena in heathenism, they are at least mimickings of the truly prophetic, and show the adaptedness of our nature to its true and high manifestation. Thus man has the organ for the prophetic. But all men have it not in the same degree. As some have a higher susceptibility for the divine, so they have for revelation, and so also, consequently, for the future. These become the organs of God's revelation to men. Such were the Old Testament prophets.

Revelation was not merely a communication of truth to their minds; it was an inspiration of their life. It was an intensifying and an elevation of their whole being. They were moved or driven (φερόμενοι) by the Holy Ghost (2 Peter i. 21). The Spirit wrought in their life, as the plastic power in the plant. This shows that the prophetic spirit is not merely infused, but also drawn out, *i. e.*, it lays hold of what is in man, as we have shown, and is not an abrupt coming into him from without, (Mark iv. 8. John xii. 24—see the Greek.) Thus they were elevated toward the truth to be revealed to them, or through them, and better adapted to be its organs. That it was through their elevated entire life, and not only to their mind, that the revelation was made, is evident from the fact that they did not always understand their own prophecies, but had, themselves, to study them afterwards, (1 Peter i. 10–12).

But the prophet is not a forced organ, used as a mere instrument. He stands freely, willingly, and consciously, in the life

of revelation itself. His own spiritual life is in sympathy with the life of which he is the organ. He experiences or suffers in himself the power of the life which he reveals. It does not possess him as the dæmon was supposed to possess the heathen soothsayers. Hence, it does no violence to him—it is not a madness (*μαντις* is derived from *μανια*, madness), but rather a purer sanity, because the spirit is raised into "a higher harmony, a diviner order, that is introduced into the soul," (Trench's Greek Syn. p. 44).

When we now call to mind the fact that the God-man had a human genealogy, as well as a divine, and that, therefore, He came through the Old Testament in flesh and blood, we can easily see how He was in Judaism, the life and soul of the prophetic voice. As He was the root as well as the offspring of David, so He was the principle as well as the object of all the Old Testament prophetic utterances. The whole Old Testament is Messianic, not only because it all looks toward Him, but also because He is its substantial life.

Though the Holy Ghost "spake by the prophets," yet the Holy Ghost can no more be separated from the second person in the Old Testament than in the New. There, as here, He took of the things of Christ, and showed them unto them, (John xvi.). Thus Christ is the principle of all prophecy, and hence the Absolute Prophet.

In the Old Testament prophets, though they were in a degree in sympathy with the divine life of revelation, there was an incongruity and disparity between their spirits and the Absolute Spirit of revelation. Hence, they could not be the organs of the fullest and highest revelation. In Christ, the human was the pure and unclouded organ of the divine, so that in Him the complete revelation could be made. In Him the prophetic reached its perfection. "His life needs not to be specially permeated with ecstatic vision; it is itself the pure harmony of the higher life," (Lange, p. 802). What was in the prophets occasional, is in Him the steady order of the higher life. They were moved upon; He has the life of prophecy in Himself.

Hence His utterances are not, as in them, produced, but

originate directly from Himself. He spake, therefore, with authority, (Mark i. 22). "The source of the authority of His words was not, as in the case of the prophets, inspiration, but the incarnation," (Martensen, p. 338). He spake as being in the Father, not merely as taught by Him. He could say: "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father," (John x. 15). And: "Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son," (Matt. x. 27; Luke x. 22.) Hence, also, the formulary with which He introduces His utterances, differs from that of the prophets. They say: "Thus saith the Lord;" but He says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you." Hence, also, while they proclaimed Him, He proclaims Himself. His revelation is a self-revelation. He does not, like them, direct to one to come, but calls the people to Himself. His life, as well as His teachings, is a revelation. He is the eternal Word incarnate.

As in His person, so in His prophetic office, He is the centre of the world and of all human history. He is the light of the world, (John viii. 12). He is the central sun, the source of light to all. The past, the present, and the future, are alike illuminated by Him, (Lange, p. 804–807). Without Him the past is an insolvable riddle, the present hopeless confusion, and the future impenetrable darkness. Apart from the explication that proceeds from Him, nothing stands in its full and proper light. He is the absolute key to all right knowledge. This will appear from several particulars.

1. He only illumines the Old Testament or all former revelations. His life shows us that the background of His incarnation in Judaism, was the true pre-history of His incarnation. His life has revealed the deep meaning that lies in it, as the flower and the fruit reveal the tree. The Old Testament prophets did not fully understand themselves. He fully understood Himself and them. As the end of the law, He is the key to the meaning of the law, ceremonial, moral, and judicial.

It is He, also, who enables us to understand the Old Testament prophets, as well as its law and ritual. Our Saviour gave utterance to this fact when He said: "Among those that are

born of woman hath not arisen a greater prophet than John the Baptist; but he that is least in the kingdom of God" (now established) "is greater than he," (Luke viii. 28; Matt. ii. 11). In the light of the New Testament, and in the thoroughly Christian mind, the Old Testament acquires a meaning which neither Moses, David, nor Isaiah, saw. How different is his knowledge, who has seen only a chrysalis, from his who has seen the winged insect that came forth from it, and who knows that all the rich glory of its last stage was involved in the crude form of the first. "The children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished; but their minds were blinded, for, until this day, remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, which veil is done away in Christ" (2 Cor. iii. 13–15). With Christ, a new sun arose which shed its revealing light back over all the former shadowy dealings of God with His people.

2. He only illumines heathenism. The heathen never understood themselves. Their own deepest and most earnest religious activities were a mystery to them. They felt themselves influenced, moulded, and controlled by higher and lower powers; but the teleology of all these forces was to them hidden.

So, also, has heathenism always been misunderstood even in Christian lands by those who fail to do justice to Christianity. Men who have felt themselves bound to condemn it as pure and unmixed error, have at the same time made it the mother of Christianity, and have regarded its different grades as successive stages in the civilization and enlightenment of the race. They have not been able to see, that whilst its misery and failure are a negative prophecy of Christ, its deeper earnestness furnishes evidence that the Creator of the race still holds it to Himself as an organic whole, has never wholly sundered Himself from its weak and wounded parts, and that, as Christ is the principle and head of humanity which He is redeeming, some veins of Christological life must be felt beating in the farthest periphery. They cannot understand what St. Paul says, when, on the fact that God has made all nations of one

blood, he predicates the fact that the nations might haply feel after Him and find Him (Acts xvii. 26–28).

Besides being thus inwardly moved, the nations are plainly controlled by God's general providence in reference to Christ. This Christ Himself clearly reveals. His kingdom is a kingdom over all. He is King of kings and Lord of lords. He came to gather together in one all things in Christ (Eph. i. 10); and to this end all things have been put under His feet, and He is made head over all things to the Church, which is His body (Eph. i. 21–23). All heathenism, therefore, unconsciously, but really, looks toward Him. "All men seek for Thee" (Mark i. 37). He is "the desire of all nations" (Hag. ii. 7). The wise men, led by a star to His manger, are a type of God's drawing power in heathenism, determining its best motions toward the grand centre. So also a wider significance than the individual event lies in that appearing of certain Greeks, who said to His disciples: "Sirs, we would see Jesus."

Lange has well said: "The teleological significance of all the great world monarchies is explained in the light of the spiritual monarchy of the Messiah. The object of the heathen world-development, the significance of Greek art, of the Roman State, of the oriental seekings, of Germanic, vigorous, youthful life,—all this comes out into its true light when brought into right relation with Him" (*Pos. Dog.*, p. 804). Without Him the history of the world has no unity, consequently no end and no meaning. His is a mere play of forces, a rude and meaningless bandying of human wills, a wild scrambling for power. Heathenism becomes a mere feeder of Sheol; a hopeless march toward death; a process which neither does, nor can, overrule in the direction of the great end of redemption. Though He makes the wrath of man to praise Him (Ps. lxxvi. 10), He is to be allowed no ability or will to make a similar use of the great, and oftentimes earnest, phenomena of heathenism, exhibiting, as it does, great and solemn processes that extend through the ages.

3. He illuminates the world of nature, the world beneath man, the natural creation. Man and the world are closely

allied, not only externally, but in inward constitution. One side of our nature rests in the world, and through that side of us its inner sense and substance reaches into the highest part of us. Hence, in the original, creating purpose of God, the world was made in reference to man. There lies, therefore, a meaning in it that looks to man, and which is only intelligible in the light which man reflects on it. As man, made in the image of God, is allied to the supernatural and divine, the world is also, through man, allied to the supernatural and divine. The divine idea, and thought, and truth lie foreshadowed in the natural world.

This is the basis of the parable. In the parable Christ illumined the natural world. He made it speak; He opened its mute lips, and made, in a deep sense, every organic form of nature a prophet and an apostle of supersensuous truth. In a degree, the world before Him, even in heathenism, saw the meaning of nature, but only in a very imperfect, shallow, and confused manner. They saw it rather as itself divine, than as a witness of divine thought. They worshiped it to their own folly, rather than read it to their own wisdom. They failed to see its relation to the divine. This is seen in the fact, that they knew and cultivated the fable rather than the parable. They held the sphere of mind apart from the sphere of nature. They saw in nature only a ludicrous mimicking man, rather than a serious teacher.

Nor did Judaism bring the power to illuminate nature, because it brought not the natural and the supernatural together in their mutual sense and meaning. They had the type, not the parable. In the type the symbols are made from above. The typical constitution, as we have it in Judaism, is the world created from above as the preparatory stage of that new creation which reached its end in Christ, and which only through Him is capable of illumining the world of nature. The parable rests on the first creation, a world which was made to be illumined from above, and which has therefore the possibility of utterance only when the true light from above touches its lips with a live coal from the altar.

The Old Testament furnishes glimpses of the true meaning of nature. Its figures and similitudes, based on outward resemblances, are brief and partial apprehensions of the sense of the world. They even rise at times into the parable under prophetic inspiration (Ezek. xvii. 2; xxix. 3; Is. v. 1–5). But all this is only as the dawn to the day, as compared with our Saviour's parables. They enter into the deep organic structure of nature, and unfold its inner foreshadowings of truth. Hence His parables show a meaning in the world which was never seen to be in it before. And so deeply did He interpret nature, that no advance of science has yet been able to discover any discrepancies in His interpretations of it.

As Christ brought the supernatural and natural together in His own divine-human nature, so He brought the two together in all subordinate respects. He showed the whole sphere of creation to be, in its wholeness, and in all its particulars, a parable of the higher world, and of His kingdom in this world through all the stages of its historical development. See the seven parables in Matt. xiii. Various classifications of the parables have been made. They cover all spheres of nature in its organic character. See Lange, p. 233, et seq., on Matthew.

The parables pertain to the operations of His kingdom in the world,—this is equal to the operations of His life in the world. This the parables show to be like the operations of all organic laws of life in the lower sphere. The higher is foreshadowed in the lower. Such meaning organic life always had, but only He revealed its existence, and pointed out its analogies.

The view, however, that the object of the parable was merely to make truth clear and impressive, is rejected by Christ Himself (Matt. xiii. 13, 14; Mark iv. 11; Luke viii. 10). The parables were designed to be an esoteric teaching. He spake parables to the outsiders, but He explained them afterwards to His disciples. His design was to conceal, as well as to reveal, His teaching, so that the wrongly disposed might have, and yet might not have, the truth; might have it, if they ever became disposed to make right use of it; might have it only in enigma as long as they were averse to Him, and disposed to abuse it.

Like all revelation, His parables were as pearls, but not to be cast before swine. In regard to them the word also holds true: "If any man will do My will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God" (John vii. 17). The parables hid the truth of His kingdom, as life is hidden in its first and most delicate stages, in its embryo and germinal state. Had the Roman civil power, or the Jewish ecclesiastical power, known what His parables concerning His kingdom meant, He would not, after He had uttered the first, have lived to utter the second.

The greatness of His teaching as it comes to light in parables lies in the fact, that these are great, continuous, perennial words of truth, which only unfold their full meaning with the progress of the historic evolution of His kingdom, on to the end of the world, and the completion of His kingdom. Nature and history go on mutually to illumine each other to the end. They give the truth in a germinal organic form, to the development of which there is no end, except with the fullness of His kingdom and glory in man and the world.

In the parable Christ first illumines nature, and then nature illumines grace; the supernatural first illumines the natural, and then the natural illumines the supernatural; heaven first illumines earth, and then earth heaven; the uncreated first illumines the created, and then the created, the uncreated. Thus Christ makes all creation transparent to man, unfolds its meaning, and shows to man in finite form the mysteries of the infinite. He is thus the absolute prophet, and the parable is the flower of the prophetic activity of Christ. The apostles afterwards never use it, either in their discourses or epistles. They use resemblances, but never attempt the parable; no doubt, because Christ alone could know and unfold the true union and life-harmony of the natural and supernatural on which the parable rests.

Christ illumines the world of spirit, divine, angelic, human. The divine, because He only reveals God; the angelic, because they are said to desire to look into the mystery of Christ's work, and to learn by the Church the manifold wisdom of God;

the human, because He only knew what was in man. In Him only does man know himself.*

THE PROPHETIC OFFICE PERENNIAL.

The prophetic office of Christ in the world did not cease with His ascension into heaven. He continues it in and through the Church.

1. The prophetic voice is still heard after Christ in the New Testament. We have prophetic utterances of St. Paul concerning the future development and manifestation of the mystery of iniquity, the man of sin (2 Thess. ii.); of St. Peter, concerning the last things (2 Pet. iii.); of St. John, in regard to the future of the Church and the world (Revelation). Reference is also made repeatedly to prophets, as in Eph. ii. 20. That not the Old Testament prophets are here meant, but the New, is evident from the fact, that they are placed in order after the apostles (so also chap. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28), and also because the article is omitted before *προφητῶν*.

It will be noticed, however, that in all these cases nothing belonging to the substance of Christianity was revealed. These revelations pertain rather to the outward fortunes of the truth, and of the Church in its historical development. They made no substantially new revelation. All this lay germinally in Christ's own teaching, especially in His wonderful pleromatic parables. Substantially He was the absolute and complete revealer.†

The spirit of inspiration, however, still continued; but its operations were rather to unfold the truth already revealed, than to impart anything new beyond what was germinally at hand. The life of Christ in them was as the power of a peren-

---

* *Mercersburg Review*, 1857, p. 169. Trench's Notes on the Parables. Cardinal Wiseman's Essays.

† In this we see the fundamental error of all humanitarian theories which regard Christ as only one in the line of prophets or revealers, along with Socrates, Plato, the Old Testament prophets, and others yet to come. Christianity is not a religion among others—not merely the highest and best, but it is the absolute religion, and the teachings of Christ contain the absolute fullness of all teaching. See Heb. i. 1.

nial revelation; but it was a revelation of His life and light, by and in the Spirit. The Spirit lifted their souls to the full apprehension of the truth as revealed by Christ, and was in them an abiding conservator against all error. The contents of revelation could not at once find relatively independent lodgement. The mind of the Church in its infancy had to be sustained by inspiration, till the faith had found full foundation. Even as it was, there was a great sinking when the apostolic office ceased, and the first fathers appeared. Why was this? Infancy must be nursed; but just so sure must a time come when nursing must cease, and self-reliance begin. The divine must not ever only bear the human,—it must become the human.

2. The prophetic function of Christ is continued in the apostolic office in the form in which this lives on in the Christian ministry. This appears from the great commission itself (Matt. xxviii. 18). Their mission is to go and teach all nations. Christ's own power is communicated to them, and His presence to the end of the world is promised them. They are fully in His stead. He teaches in and by them. "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me" (Luke x. 16). "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you" (John xx. 21; Acts i. 8).

For the perpetuation of this prophetic office regular provision was made in the solemn rite of ordination and succession in office. "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2, and 1 Tim. iv. 13, 14). The prophetic office of Christ is perpetuated in all regularly appointed and ordained teachers of the Church who stand, in their teaching, in the true dogmatic development of truth, as this comes down in the history of the Church, and who do not present merely their own opinions. "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation" (2 Pet. i. 20). He errs who claims that he is directly taught from the Word, or from heaven. Man does not come *into* the race, but *in* it. He does not get his flesh and blood direct from

God; just as little does he get his faith and knowledge direct. He is a member of the organic race, and not an isolated individual. He must gather up from the past, and stand in it. His teaching must rest in the life of the dogma, not in his own private judgment. His private judgment must be moulded and modified by the dogma.

Christ's prophetic life, as continued in the Church through His ministry, preserves the purity of its teachings. Though presumptuous persons may err, and lead their kind into error, the meek will He ever guide in judgment; the meek will He show His way (Ps. xxv. 9). There is a sense in which the prophetic office of Christ in the Church keeps it infallible.

3. Christ's prophetic office is continued in the Church through the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost ever mediates the truth of Christ, as He does the life of Christ, to the ministry and members of the body of Christ. It is He who makes the truth objectively revealed, to be subjectively apprehended by men. This office of the Spirit our Saviour brings out with great emphasis and clearness. When He was about preparing to go away, He said to His disciples, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth" (John xvi. 13). But He adds, that the Spirit shall "not speak of Himself;" that is, shall make no revelation of new truth, but "He shall receive of mine and show it unto you." Hence He is called "the Spirit of truth" (John xiv. 17; xv. 26). "The Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John xiv. 26; see also 1 Cor. ii. 10–15). The Holy Ghost is the perennial commentator of the word of God in the bosom of the Church.

4. Though Christ did not, in form, aim at creating or illuminating any science, He nevertheless impregnated the world of humanity with the genius of true science, so that in the history of the world all true wisdom springs from Him. He is

1. The principle of all science. The whole created world is related to Him in the plan or idea which underlies it. Hence

all spheres of things, as their ruling principles are developed into science, have a principial relation to Him, and are in their true scientific position only when seen as illuminated by Him. Hence the principles of the Platonic philosophy lived longest, and exerted the most favorable influence on human minds in relation to Christianity, because it was most allied to Christianity. No anti-Christian principle of science in any sphere has been able long to maintain itself.

2. He gives to science its true teleology. His life and light as the ruling powers of the world constantly makes science and all knowledge contribute to the advancement of Christian principles, and to work subserviently to the Christian end.

3. His life and light are the true impulse of all science and knowledge. As Christianity restores to man the true and the highest human life, it gives to it the highest possible vigor. This is attested by a comparison between heathen and Christian intellectual illumination, between science in heathenism and science in Christianity. In Him are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col. ii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 20).

In this feature of Christ's prophetic office, also, as in all others, though He antagonizes all existing unchristian science, He still uses it; takes up its substantial achievements; regenerates and consecrates them to His own higher use. As the absolute prophet, He takes up all the lower shadowy endeavors in the thinking of humanity, underlays them with a new principle, gives them a new impulse, and a new teleology. He is the light of all minds, and true interpreter of all things in the sphere of science, from the lowest science up to the science of sciences.

Art. VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Lange's Commentary: First and Second Kings.

This is the fifth volume of the Old Testament series. Its author is the Rev. Dr. Bähr, of Carlsruhe, who in 1837–39 published a learned and justly celebrated work on the *Symbolism of Mosaic Worship*, and another in 1848 on the *Temple of Solomon*. His previous studies in the Old Testament have given him a special fitness for his present task,—a task to which he brings his indefatigable German industry and his extensive German scholarship, and which, it is scarcely necessary to say, has been accomplished as few others could have accomplished it. The fruit of his labors is a much needed and almost invaluable Commentary on an interesting but very difficult portion of the Bible. "The translation from the German, with additions, was executed by the Rev. Dr. Harwood, of New Haven, Conn., who assumed the First Book, and by the Rev. W. G. Sumner, of Morristown, N. J., who is responsible for the last chapter of the First and the whole of the Second Book. The textual revision and original grammatical notes on the First Book must be credited to the Rev. Dr. Frederick Gardiner, Professor in the Berkely Divinity School, Middletown, Conn."

It cannot be otherwise, we think, than that Lange's Commentary shall work great good in this country. The American public is much indebted to Dr. Schaff for rendering it accessible to English readers. Prepared by some of the greatest minds in Germany, and giving the latest and best results of German research, the volumes already issued have taken high rank at home. They form in themselves an extensive exegetical library; for they do not merely give the opinions of the several authors, and the grounds on which these opinions rest, but they also present and discuss the views of the ablest commentators generally, thus affording the data for an independent judgment. They do not shrink from difficulties, critical, historical, or theological, or waive them aside, as if they were unworthy of serious consideration; but, looking them fairly in the face, they grapple with them manfully, and seek a true solution. The great importance of this Commentary lies in this, that it embodies, in a sufficiently popular form, the later believing theology of Germany,—a theology of the highest significance for our age, inasmuch as it has grown up during a long conflict with almost every phase of unbelief—with the vulgar rationalism of men like Paulus, the transcendentalism and moralism of Kant, the idealism of the elder Fichte, the pantheism of Schelling and Hegel, the mythical school of Strauss, the "tendenz" theory of Baur, the sensualistic

materialism of scientists like Vogt. This theology America needs, and the need is supplied to a large extent for those, who are not familiar with the German language, by the translation of Lange's Commentary.

The volume on Kings will not be found inferior to its predecessors. As space does not admit of an extended review, we shall simply notice a few points in the valuable Introduction. Sect. 1 discusses the Name, Date of Composition, and Author. Dr. Bähr rightly assigns the composition to the second half of the exile, between the years 562 and 536. He rejects the Jewish tradition, accepted by Hävernick, as well as some of the older theologians, that it was written by Jeremiah; for at the time of its composition, Jeremiah must have been from 86 to 88 years old,—an advanced age, which renders it improbable that he was the author of a work which presupposes the employing and arranging of different older written sources. Besides, Jeremiah, after the destruction of Jerusalem, went to Egypt, where he spent his remaining days; whereas, the Book was written, according to Bähr, in Babylon, or at least not in Egypt, as is evident from the absence of all references to Egyptian situations and relations. Yet the author's mode of thinking and expression undeniably resembles that of Jeremiah, from which it may perhaps be inferred, that he was a scholar of that prophet. Sect. 2 treats in a masterly way of the Sources. Three sources, and only three, are cited:—the *Book of the Acts of Solomon*, the *Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah*, and the *Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel.* Bähr thinks that these were each an independent work, that they contained more than the author of Kings has incorporated, and that they were in existence and circulation at the time he wrote. What were these documents, and by whom were they written? It so happens that a whole series of paragraphs in Kings is repeated word for word in Chronicles. In this case there is no reference to any of the three documents cited in Kings, but to the writings of given individuals, as their sources—to Nathan, the prophet; Ahijah, the Shilonite; Iddo, the Seer; Isaiah, the son of Amoz, and others; and from this Bähr infers that the three documents lying at the foundation of the Books of Kings were not the production of one author, but that each of them was made up of the writings of different, and, in fact, prophetic, authors, who recorded the history of their own times. These single, isolated writings of the prophets were afterward collected and preserved, probably in the so-called schools of the prophets. The view maintained in this volume respecting the documentary sources differs from the current view, which regards them as public, annual registers, or annals, kept by some royal official, and deposited in the State archives, from which the author of the Books of Kings made extracts. Bähr has ably shown that this view is untenable; and, indeed, its advocates are driven to assume other unnamed authorities, because there is so much matter that could not possibly have

been in the official annals. But while the author refers to the sources whence he drew his facts about thirty times, and refers to them even when he writes of those kings that only reigned a short time, yet he does not once quote any other work. Now, as the greater part of the contents of Kings could not have been taken from the court annals, it would be inexplicable that the author should never have named his other authorities. In Sect. 3 Bähr strongly maintains the unity and independence of the Books of Kings, in opposition to De Wette, Ewald, and other negative critics; and in Sect. 4 he recognizes their perfect credibility, as indeed all others must, if they hold with him that the authorities from which they are compiled are the writings of prophets who were contemporaries of the events described. Unlike De Wette, he finds in them no myths, nor does he find legends, as does Phenius; he finds in them rather a reliable history of God's people, from Solomon to the Captivity, – history written, indeed, from the theocratic point of view, but, on that very account, history in the truest and fullest sense of the word. He does not stumble at the miracles these Books record, but regards them rather as the central point of this history, standing or falling with it. He rightly says that, "in fact, what is stated to be fabulous in these Books is so interwoven with what is admitted as historical, that they can only be arbitrarily separated; and every attempt to decide where history ceases and fable begins, appears arbitrary and vain." But our notice is already too extended, and we must refer our readers to the volume itself. They will find in it a full and learned discussion of all questions growing out of the Books of Kings, especially the critical, historical and chronological questions, which have of late assumed so much importance. F. A. G.

Within and Without. *A Poem by George Macdonald, LL. D., Author of "Wilfrid Cumbermede," etc. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co.* 1872.

This is a poem of considerable merit, so far as we are able to judge. Its excellency for us, however, lies not in the general plan and scope of the story, but in single parts and passages. So far as the general plan is concerned, it is only a repetition of that of Wilfrid Cumbermede. Indeed, the author seems to make it a point to leave his tale so involved at the close, as to require some sort of complement in the other world. That is his main idea. The imperfections and contradictions of this present life must be supplemented and explained in the life to come. The actual here never reaches the ideal. Every human life, therefore, comes short, and the individual dies with his work but half done, and, because but half done, involved often in irreconcilable contradiction and utter confusion. This is all correct. We have not much confidence,

however, in representations of the other world, which carry the temporary, earthly relations thither. In the case of this poem, for instance, a marriage relation is the occasion for misapprehension on both sides. Each fails to understand the other. The loving wife deserts the husband for the husband's good, under the impression that she is not loved. There is a partial explanation, but the curtain of death falls upon the scene before the explanation reaches all the parties. Then, in the other world, the subject is carried out,—husband, wife, child, there mingle in the purity of mutual love, &c. No one can read the poem without experiencing its power.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. *A Series of Discourses by Eliphalet Nott, D.D, LL.D., late President of Union College. With an Introduction and Notes by Tayler Lewis. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., Successors to Charles Scribner & Co.* 1872.

These are interesting and instructive sermons, and are designed to cover a certain portion of the ground of the Evidences of Christianity. Evidences of this kind certainly have a place, but, notwithstanding the strong language of Tayler Lewis to the contrary, we are of the opinion, that the Evidences must be placed on a new basis, not so much for correcting and meeting new errors, but for their own sake.

Such evidence as is addressed to the common reason, to prove that Christ arose from the dead, that there could have been no deception, such as stealing away the body, &c., seems to us not only of no positive value, but calculated rather to do harm. Clearly our Saviour placed no dependence upon it, or He would have appeared to His enemies and compelled belief. The resurrection is a supernatural fact, and can be comprehended only by faith. It has its own nature and constitution, and in order to lay hold of it in its true, living character, the individual must come into union by faith with the world in which it stands. You can, indeed, prove by rational arguments that the body of Christ was resuscitated and left the tomb, but this is not the mystery of the resurrection. To take it as such is just to misapprehend the nature of the mystery. This point is set forth by the whole conduct of our Saviour towards men in leading them to faith in His person. Where there was no aptitude, nothing but sense and reason called into exercise, He rather sought to conceal the mystery of His person, because it could only be perverted in such natural apprehension. It is just as true now that the natural man cannot apprehend the things of the Spirit. Hence men must be laid hold of first by those spiritual aptitudes which, under the influence of the Spirit, can lay hold of the supernatural —and where these are not in exercise, any argument addressed to the mere natural reason can accomplish but little.

The latter portion of the book before us does, indeed, rise to a sense of this, where the author dwells on the attesting descent of the Spirit, the spread of Christianity, Christ risen in the history of the Church, etc. But the labored argument to prove there was no theft of the body has, to our mind, but little value or weight.

These sermons are published in handsome style, and their publication is a grateful tribute to the memory of a worthy servant of Christ, who labored many years in the great work of College education. They will doubtless be read with interest by the many sons of Union College who still remember Dr. Nott as a venerable father, and for so many years the President of their Alma Mater.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. *Delivered in Edinburgh in* 1872. *By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., Successors to Charles Scribner & Co.* 1872.

Dean Stanley is well known to the theological public as the author of Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, on the History of the Eastern Church, on Sinai and Palestine, &c. He has won reputation for his graphic style, as well as vigorous thought. In the present work this reputation is well sustained. It contains an introductory sermon of much force and beauty on the Eleventh Commandment, besides four lectures on the following topics:— 1. The Celtic, the Medieval, and the Episcopal Churches. 2. The Church of Scotland, the Covenant, and the Seceding Churches. 3. The Moderation of the Church of Scotland. 4. The Present and the Future of the Church of Scotland. In the opening sermon he narrates the anecdote, which has found its way, under various modifications, into print, of Archbishop Usher, the Primate of Ireland, who, as an unknown stranger, knocked at the door of the manse of Rutherford, and begged shelter for the night. The minister kindly received him, and asked him to take his place amongst the family and assist at their religious exercises. It so happened that the question in the Catechism which came to the stranger's turn was that which asks, "How many commandments are there?" He answered, "Eleven." "Eleven!' exclaimed Rutherford—"I am surprised that a man of your age and appearance should not know better! What do you mean?" And he answered, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." The next day, Rutherford ascertained who the stranger was, and requested him to preach for him, which he did, on the words that had so startled his host the evening before.

The sermon is admirably adapted to the times, as it brings out some important thoughts on a subject which occupies the attention of the Churches now, perhaps, more than any other.

The warmth and liberality with which the author speaks of the Scottish Church in the different periods of its history, shows the largeness of his mind and spirit. Scotland cannot boast of a formal, mechanical succession through a particular form of Episcopal ordination. In its early period the Abbot of Iona was the Primate. Indeed, in Scotland and Ireland the first great work of Christianization was done by abbots and monks." The abbots and Presbyters of Iona ordained or consecrated the bishops they sent forth to England; and it is therefore exceedingly probable that the Episcopal succession of the Northern provinces of England has been deeply colored by Presbyterian blood."

The author gives some account of the windings in the more recent Scottish Church History, and expresses himself decidedly in favor of the Established Church, though he speaks in the highest terms of the great and good Chalmers, the leader of the secession and establishment of the Free Church. On account of his position on this subject, a course of lectures has been called out on the other side, which have been received with great favor. Altogether, we commend these graphic pictures of Church life in the history of Scotland, and welcome them as a valuable addition to the rapidly growing literature on Church History.

A HIDDEN LIFE AND OTHER POEMS. *By George Macdonald, LL. D., Author of "Within and Without," "Wilfrid Cumbermede," etc. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co.* 1872.

The author of this book has gained celebrity as a writer of fiction. This, we think, is among his first appearances as a poet. It is a book that requires to be studied. At times the verse seems somewhat rugged, but it is everywhere made the vehicle of profound thought. We see in it a great soul struggling with the great religious and social problems of the age. Many of the poems are founded on Scripture subjects, and in a certain sense the whole volume is deeply religious; yet we seem constantly to hear the cry of the patriarch, "O that I knew where I might find Him!" Like so many other great minds of the present age, the author seems to be on the high-sea, having cut loose from the moorings of implicit, child-like faith, and with the Atlantic's shores, which he hopes to reach, not yet in sight.

Nevertheless, it is a book that is worthy of a permanent place in the library of every one who is able to appreciate it. Without being in the least flashy or flimsy, it contains many passages which are simply magnificent. We intend to study it carefully, and would advise our readers to do the same.

The execution of the book leaves nothing to be desired. It is beautifully printed on tinted paper, so that reading it becomes a luxury.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1872.

ART. I.—NATURE AND GRACE.*

BY J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN, D. D.

No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.—John iii. 13.

To reach the full sense of this remarkable declaration on the part of our Lord Jesus Christ, we need to have clearly before us the occasion on which it was uttered.

There was a man of the Pharisees, we are told, by name Nicodemus, a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim, and a leading master or teacher in Israel. The same came to Jesus by night: and said unto Him; "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him."

The object of the address was to draw the Saviour into an exposition of His views and aims, in the prophetical character in which He appeared; and it was prompted by the serious thought, no doubt, that the new prophet might be indeed the

* A Baccalaureate Sermon preached to the late Graduating Class of Franklin and Marshall College, on the evening of the last Sunday in June, in the First Reformed Church of Lancaster, Pa.

Messiah promised to the fathers, and that the time had come possibly for the solemn inauguration of His kingdom. In this feeling Nicodemus was not alone, at that time, among the rulers of his nation. He spake for others as well as for himself; "*We* know, that thou art a teacher come from God!" The miracles performed by Jesus were the seal of His divine mission; and those who sat in Moses' seat, the guardians of the ancient Jewish faith—some of them at least—were inclined to come to an understanding with Him in regard to the kingdom of God He had in His mind, and if it were found satisfactory to join also the weight of their character and influence with Him in bringing it to pass.

All this, however, rested as we can easily see on a radically defective apprehension, both of the person of Christ and of the work for which He had come into the world. The stand-point of Nicodemus, over against the revelation of God in Christ, was that of rationalistic supernaturalism. Christ was for him at most a teacher sent from God, a prophet like unto Moses, holding in His hand an outward commission from heaven, duly certified by His miracles as outward seals. He was a man clothed with divine powers for the accomplishment of a divine work; but the divinity which was perceived to be in Him and with Him, came to no real union with His humanity. This was the defect of the Jewish idea of the Messiah in general; a defect, for which there was no effectual help indeed, until Christ Himself appeared as the full object of the Christian faith. Before that the Messianic conception was necessarily dualistic, and the dualism had no power to save itself from ultimate humanitarianism as expressed in the creed of Nicodemus, "Thou art a *man* come from God." It is in substance the Ebionitic heresy, which figures so largely afterwards in the early history of the Christian Church. In the view of such thinking, Christianity could be only a continuation of Judaism out to its own last result and end, and nothing more. The days of the Messiah were to be in some way the efflorescence simply of the Old Testament theocracy, in the midst of outward signs and wonders, into the highest perfection of its own order of life. So

Nicodemus, with others of like mind with himself, looked for the advent of the kingdom of God, and mused in his spirit at this time on the possibility that Jesus of Nazareth might be that prophet raised up of God to bring about the restoration of Israel by its means.

To this general wrong posture of mind on the part of the venerable Jewish rabbi, rather than to his somewhat diplomatic speech directly, our Saviour addressed His profoundly soul-awakening reply: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

It is unfortunate certainly, that the Greek term ἄνωθεν, in this passage, should be rendered in our version by the adverb *again*, when it signifies in truth, properly and immediately, *from above*. Any birth indeed that is new, however it may be brought to pass, is of course a regeneration, or being born again, and may be properly so named. But plainly it is not just the thought of being born *again*, in the ordinary religious sense of the term regeneration (familiar as this was to the Jewish mind in connection with the Jewish proselyte baptism), that our Saviour here means to press on the attention of Nicodemus; it is rather, instead of this, the thought that lies immediately in the primary sense of the word ἄνωθεν itself, as denoting a birth "from above," from beyond the natural order of the world's life; and His declaration should read accordingly: "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This kingdom was not to be considered a mere last product of the constitution of Judaism in any form; it was the revelation of a new, higher order of life in the world, descending directly from God Himself; and the first condition therefore even of seeing it, or of understanding in any way its true nature, could be nothing less than a principle of new heavenly life proceeding also from God, or in other words a new birth derived from the womb of the kingdom itself which was to be thus known and entered.

That this was our Saviour's meaning is rendered plain from what He adds immediately after: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can-

not enter into the kingdom of God." Here being "born from above" is made equivalent to being "born of the Spirit;" while the conjunction of the water with the Spirit serves of itself to sunder the sense of all previous Jewish purifications and lustrations (ending in the baptism of John), from the higher consecration thus brought into view. The terrestrial symbol was to become full and complete now through actual union with its true celestial sense; according to that word spoken to the Baptist: "Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." The birth from above is more than the washing of a simply moral or theocratic regeneration even in its highest form; it goes beyond all this; it is a birth not of water only, but "of water and of the Spirit." It is the introduction of a new divine principle into the being of the soul. It is not in any way of nature, or from the powers of man's life existing before itself. As related to all this it is transcendental and supernatural. It is in such view the opposite of all earthly natural birth, a birth literally and strictly *from above.*

The contrast could not be put in stronger terms than it is by what our Lord adds in explanation of it: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." The life of nature can have no power to transcend or rise beyond itself. Its birth is the measure of its capabilities whether physical or moral. If man is to attain then to a true divine life, it must be by the coming down of this life into him as something more than flesh. He must be born of the Spirit. Only what is from the Spirit in this way can be itself spirit, capable of having place and part in the kingdom of God.

The necessity of a communion between earth and heaven, between man and God, that should be something more than a moral or spiritual rising simply of the human to the divine in the order of the human itself; the necessity of a real coming down of the divine into the sphere of the human, to make room for such supernatural communion, as the only true idea of the kingdom of God; that is the great thought which governs and underlies throughout the discourse of our Saviour with Nicode-

mus, and which leads also in the end to the true view of what Christ Himself was as the solution of this problem and the founder of this kingdom. He was no mere teacher come from God, the reporter of divine oracles attested in an outside way by divine miracles. He was nothing less than the very presence of God Himself among men in human form. "We speak that we do know," He says, "and testify that we have seen." He was empowered to tell of heavenly things, not as knowing them in an earthly way by outward testimony or argument, but as one who was Himself an inmate of heaven, and an eye-witness of the things that are there. That was the capacity in which He appeared among men. That was the nature of His mission and work in the world. That was the key to the true and full sense of the Messianic kingdom which He had come to establish, and of which Nicodemus was now present to inquire. So much, and no less, the idea of that kingdom demanded, if it was to be what the need of the world required, a real restoration of man to the lost life of heaven. No such restoration could start from below, from the fallen life of man himself; it must descend upon man from God. "No man," as our text has it, "hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven"

There is brought into view here what may be termed a fundamental and universal law of our human spiritual life. This is determined in its very nature toward God, by a force which can become effectual for its end at the same time only through power descending into it from God. "Thou awakest us to delight in Thy praise," says St. Augustine; "for Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it rest in Thee."

In a still wider view, indeed, the whole world is in this way carried toward God as its ultimate end; and its upward movement everywhere is upheld and sustained, in each stage of its rising course, by the energy of a higher existence flowing down into it from above. In other words, final causes everywhere are the actuating soul of efficient causes.

Thus it is that the unorganized elements of nature, air, water, light, heat, force, have their full meaning only in the

metamorphosis or transmutation they are made to undergo through the law of life, and first of all the plastic principle of plant life, bringing them into a new and higher mode of existence. And just so it is again that this first and lowest order of organization, the plant world, reaches forth of itself toward that which is above it, the sphere of animal life; into which it has power actually to pass, however, only as it is itself caught up again, by a force descending into it from that superior sphere itself; a force which imparts a new quality, by assimilation, to all the elements that come under its action, and which serves to advance them thus one degree nearer than before to the last grand object of their creation.

But it is in the transition of nature from the animal to man, in whom nature transcends itself by rising into the life of mind or spirit, that the law in question comes finally to its clearest manifestation. Here is a metamorphosis or glorification, a sublimation of the world, which surpasses immeasurably all going before, while it throws a sea of light, at the same time, back on the whole movement of creation, revealing what had been in truth the inmost working sense of it from the beginning. But that sense or end (the teleology of the entire cosmos) is now most of all seen to be a power, working down into nature, and lifting it up into its own higher sphere. "There is a *spirit* in man," we are told, "and the inspiration or inbreathing of the Almighty giveth him understanding." It is as joined with this higher principle in man, as transmuted in this way into the spirituality of thought, and made to mirror itself in the human intelligence, that the world in its natural order is as it were carried above and beyond itself, and is thus raised to its highest glory in the scheme of creation.

And all this, we now say, is but an analogy and adumbration in the world of nature of the great spiritual law, presented to us by our present subject; the law, whereby the rational nature of man again, in which the lower world becomes complete, is inwardly necessitated to seek its perfection and supreme good also beyond itself and in God; while it is able to do so effectually, at the same time, only as the

light and life of heaven are made first to flow down into it for that purpose.

It is not simply the existence of *sin*, as sometimes seems to be imagined, that requires this order. Apart from the fact, of the fall altogether, and before the fall, we meet with it in the Garden of Eden. The image of God which belonged to our unfallen nature there, formed of itself for this nature the necessity of its communion with God; while that communion, however, had place only by the coming down of the Divine presence to make it possible. God revealed Himself to our first parents in Paradise, and they heard His voice, we are told, as of one walking and conversing with them in the most immediately personal way.

But if the union of man with God needed even before the fall this bowing of the heavens, this coming down of the divine into the sphere of the earthly and human, to make it a reality and not a mere aspiration or dream, how much more must the same condition be regarded as holding necessarily of what the state of man became after the fall, through which the light that was in him has been turned into darkness, and the strength of his original righteousness, is changed into the melancholy weakness of original sin!

How incompetent he is in such fallen condition to solve the great problem of religion, and thus satisfy the inmost and deepest need of his own being, by rising above himself and entering into true life-communion with the heavenly and divine, is shown abundantly by the history of his efforts and endeavors in this direction from the beginning.

The old mythological story of the earth-born giants striving to scale the heavens in an outward physical way, by piling high mountains one upon another, is but an image or parable of these struggles, by which humanity thrown upon its own resources has vainly sought in the use of its best powers, through all ages, to rise with inward moral elevation to the true knowledge and possession of the Divine.

Neither in the way of intelligence nor in the way of will, neither in thought nor in life, was the ancient *Paganism* able

in any sort to actualize what was felt to be here the inmost sense of religion, and the chief end of man. Its heroes rose to the dignity of demi-gods by their imaginary virtue; its philosophers soared high above the earth by their imaginary wisdom. But in neither case was there any true ascending into heaven, any true bringing down of God and heavenly things into felt union and communion with the life of man on the earth. That was something which no moral Hercules, and no speculative Pythagoras or Plato, had power even in the least degree to compass or bring to pass. Virtue in such form, and wisdom in such form, were after all humanitarian only; flesh, born of the flesh, and not spirit, born of the Spirit; which as such accordingly could neither see nor enter into the kingdom of God.

The history of the Pagan world before Christ was in this way a preparation for His advent. It was a grand demonstration of the total inability of the world, to fulfil the idea of religion by raising itself to a true knowledge of God; and an argument thus for the necessity of a descending movement on the part of God Himself, a Divine self-revelation on the side of God in the fullest sense of the term, to make such religion possible. It was an experiment indeed, according to St. Paul, for this very purpose. "After that in the wisdom of God," he tells us, 1 Cor. i. 21, "the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Christianity came as the easy and simple answer for faith to the question of ages, which for the wisdom of the old Oriental world, the wisdom of Egypt, and the later wisdom of Greece, had been through long centuries before, a source only of interminable confusion and despair.

But granting all this in the case of the Gentile world before Christ, how does it affect, it may be asked, the case of the *Jewish* world before Christ? Was not the want of the Gentile world actually met there in the form of divine revelation, ages in advance of His advent in the flesh; and was not this a real solution of the great life problem of humanity, the uniting of man with God in the way of religion, back altogether of what

our Saviour here, in His conversation with Nicodemus, declares to be the only true solution of it, namely: His own personal descent as the Son of Man from heaven?

To this there can be but one answer, if Christ Himself is true. All revelation before Christ was relative and partial only, having its ultimate reality in Him alone; and so all religion in the Jewish form was also only relative and partial, a prolepsis simply as far as it went of the full new birth of Christianity, the "shadow and not the very image" of what it prefigured, that as such could reach its own full completion only beyond this life, and after Christ actually came (Heb. xi. 13, 39, 40). Christ was in the world, as the eternal Logos, before He became incarnate, and so also was the Holy Ghost; but neither one nor the other in the same sense, or with like power, as afterwards. The difference was that between Christ coming (or about to come) and Christ actually come; that between the promise of the Holy Ghost, as the power of the new creation in Christ Jesus, and the actual gift or sending of the Holy Ghost, which took place when Christ was glorified, and which could not, we are told, take place before (John vii. 39.)

Judaism thus, as we know, was also but a preparation for Christ; not a mere negative preparation indeed like Gentilism; on the contrary a Divinely ordered positive preparation, the very portico of entrance itself, we may say, into the glorious sanctuary of His presence; but still a preparation only for the Christian fact, and not the full power of the fact itself in its own proper form. What the Baptist says of himself, holds good of the whole dispensation ending in his person. It was the voice of one crying in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord and make His paths straight." It was not the kingdom of God or of heaven, of which our Saviour speaks in His discourse with Nicodemus.

In a profound sense, therefore, the declaration, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven," applies in all its force to the Old Testament prophets no less than to the heroes, lawgivers and sages of the ancient heathen world. Moses, Elias, and Isaiah, had been as little

able in their time to ascend up to heaven, in the sense of this declaration, as either Zoroaster or Confucius, Pythagoras or Plato. Not even the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, by which they were moved, carried them to any such height as this. They spake as they were thus moved, but the oracles they uttered had not their origin in themselves, and were not drawn directly and immediately from their own knowledge. They could not say of the things of heaven, as Christ does, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." They performed miracles and uttered prophecies; but no one of them could have dared to say with Jesus Christ: "I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me: the words that I speak unto you, I speak not of Myself; but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works."

No one of them could have dared to say, with Him: "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go to the Father." Or that other word of like astounding import: "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father; and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." Speech of this sort, we all feel, would have been horrid blasphemy from any lips other than those of Jesus Christ; whereas proceeding from Him it is felt as only in harmony with His universal character and presence, and produces no shock. He stands alone among the Old Testament prophets; the end of their glorious succession, and yet immeasurably more than all of them put together, as we are expressly told by the last and greatest among them, John the Baptist. "Of His fulness," he says, "have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

We have the same broad contrast of relative and absolute revelation brought into view again in the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is said: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers

by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of *his* glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." —Heb. i. 1, 2, 3.

This transcendent order of the Saviour's ministry is plainly set forth in what took place at His baptism; when, as He came up out of the water, the heavens were opened unto Him, we are told, the Spirit of God descended upon Him in bodily form, and from above was heard the voice of the Father Himself, saying: "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." This it was indeed that proclaimed to John the Baptist the full sense of His Messiahship over against all the inspirations and theophanies of the Old Testament, and enabled that great witness to say: "I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God." Heaven and earth were joined together in His person. He was the true tabernacle of God among men.

Of like import with this demonstration on the banks of the Jordan was the vision afterwards of Tabor; that high mountain apart into which Jesus brought Peter, James, and John his brother; and where He was transfigured before them, so that His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light. In the midst of this splendor, there appeared unto them, it is said, two men, also in shining apparel, which were Moses and Elias; who talked with Him, and spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. And, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them, the symbol of Jehovah's presence, and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him." Here, the secondary and dependent character of the universal Old Testament revelation, as related to Christ, is brought into view in the most solemn and impressive manner. Its great representatives, Moses and Elias, the founder and the restorer of the Law, had ages before ascended to heaven—the last even in an outward chariot of fire, and without the usual form of death. Yet here they appear as owing all their glory to Him who had

come after them, and their presence is but the occasion for showing forth the absolutely incomparable majesty which belonged to Him, as the Son of Man, who was at the same time the only begotten Son of God.

These two titles, meeting in the conception of the Messiah, condition each other and come in the end to the same sense.

The law of centralization runs through our whole human life, and finds its end at last only in the idea of a grand central Man, who as such must be at once one and universal, the second Adam, the head and representative of the race in its true ideal perfection. That, and nothing less, is the meaning of the Messianic title *Son of Man.*

But such an ultimate centre of humanity, having power to recapitulate and hold together its universal life as one, must be at the same time more than human, must be the power of a higher divine life revealing itself in and through the human, for the purpose of raising it into real union and fellowship with God. This is what St. Paul has in his mind where he speaks (Eph. i. 10,) of the gathering together in one of all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth. No simple ascension of the human out of its own sphere, not even the translation of an Enoch or the fiery sublimation of an Elias, could open the way for any such intercourse and communion between earth and heaven. The power making this possible must first of all start from above. The life of God must reach down into the life of man, so as to lift this up into its own higher sphere. So much, and nothing less, is what is signified to us by the Messianic title *Son of God.*

Only the Son of God thus *could* be the Son of Man; and Jesus is the Messiah, because He was in the days of His flesh, and still is, and will always continue to be, the union of these two distinctions, "conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary," both God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever.

The central exclusiveness, and absolute completeness, of the mediation of Jesus Christ, are expressed alike in both titles; and faith in the one is necessarily at the same time faith also in the other.

"Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel," exclaimed Nathanael, struck with the first evidence he had of the superior nature of Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus, in reply, intones the correlative significance of what He was on His earthly human side. "Thou shalt see greater things than these," He tells him. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the *Son of Man*." Heaven in free communication with earth; angels ascending and descending between the two otherwise sundered worlds; but all centering in the glorious mystery of the Incarnation, where the Son of God and the Son of Man meet together as one. The descending movement in this way first; only so, however, as to become at once an ascending movement also, raising the life of humanity into real union with the life of God.

"Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" To this question of our Lord, we are told (Matthew xvi. 14), the common answer ran, "John the Baptist, Elias, Jeremias, or one of the prophets;" humanitarian conceptions all, at best, of the Messiahship required for the full ideal completion of the human race. But for Peter, and his fellow-apostles, the Son of Man was infinitely more than this. "Thou art the Christ," they say, "the Son of the living God;" and the answer, as we know, was the heaven-inspired response of faith to the challenge of the divinity itself, which shone forth immediately from His person. They saw and felt in Him a man, who was greater than all men besides. A man, who stood solitary and alone among the children of men, and yet comprehended in Himself the inmost and deepest sense of humanity. A man, in one word, the absolute completeness of whose humanity showed Him to be more than man, revealed in Him and through Him the glory of a higher world, and thus proved Him to be the world's true Christ or Messiah, the Son of Man who was at the same time, as such, the only begotten Son of God.

Such in a general view is the order of the Christian salvation, the economy of the kingdom of God, on which our Saviour seeks to fasten the wondering attention of Nicodemus, in the

passage we have before us as a text at this time: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven."

In full symphony with this, we seem to hear St. Paul's triumphal pæan (Eph. iv. 9, 10,) chanted so grandly to the Ephesians: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things."

Redemption for man, deliverance from the power of sin and death; not in the mode of any outward superficial change merely wrought from below, through the natural resources of humanity itself, or by the illapse even of heavenly influences coming in to adjust these resources in their own order; but only in the mode of a new divine life, proceeding forth from God in personal form, and taking hold of the fallen life of the world in a real historical way, so as to rescue it from the captivity of Satan and raise it to the light of immortality and heaven: this is what Christianity means, and it is not possible that it can be rightly understood or made of proper practical account in any other view.

From the whole subject allow me now in conclusion, my dear pupils, members of the Graduating Class of 1872, to draw in brief terms a few general lessons of high practical moment, which I ask you to take with you from the solemnity of the present hour as my paternal farewell charge, for the use of your lives in time to come. The lessons you will at once perceive, are not new; they have formed in one way or another the burden of what you have been taught in the way of religion through your whole college course. But they are lessons at the same time which can never grow old, and which it is especially proper therefore to emphasize and enforce upon your attention on this occasion.

1. Christianity is not primarily a doctrine for the understanding, nor a rule of conduct for the will, but a principle of life for the soul deeper than either understanding or will, and carrying in it the power of a divine regeneration for all that the soul is, or is capable of becoming, in any other view.

2. As *life* in this sense, accordingly, religion is infinitely more than the conception of any supposed natural morality and virtue, which under the name of life is made too often to stand in the room of all religious theory and faith; as when it is said:

> "For points of faith let graceless zealots fight,
> *His* can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

Practice in *that* view is just as little true life, in the deep Christian sense of the term, as knowledge or doctrine. Life in the Christian sense of the term involves faith; for it is a birth from above, which as such cannot be without some apprehension of its own supernal origin and source.

3. So much is comprehended at once in the idea of this supernal birth itself, as it is presented to us in the Gospel. For it is no re-ordering merely of the natural powers of the soul; nor yet any general influence simply of the Divine Spirit upon the human spirit, that the new birth here signifies, as we have now seen from our Saviour's discourse with Nicodemus. On the contrary, what it signifies is incorporation by the power of the Holy Ghost, figured in holy baptism, into the new life which has been brought into the world by the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ; "who, being God of God, very God of very God, dwelling in the bosom of the Father from all eternity, at last when the fulness of the time was come, came down from heaven, and became man, for us men and for our salvation;" who "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification;" who, "by His appearing hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel;" and who by the sending of the Holy Ghost, and the institution of the Church, has made room for the real, historical and objective presence of this new order of life among His people to the end of time.

4. We cannot then make too much of the Person of Christ, regarded as the principle and ground of the Christian salvation. He is not the mere functionary simply through whom this salvation is administered and made known; He is the very substance and power of the salvation itself; it holds through-

out in the constitution of His mediatorial life, which by its very nature has been, and is still, in the most real historical way, the entire mystery of godliness, ordained before all ages for the redemption and glorification of the world. To the question: "What think ye of Christ? whose son is He?" it is not enough for us to respond: "He is the son of David." He must be for us in full earnest at the same time also the Son of the Living God. In other words, He must be to us in His own personal being more than all His heavenly teaching and divine working. These are great, and greatly to be magnified, as the objective matter of Christian faith; but deeper than all this, and before all this, He is Himself the ultimate fundamental object of that faith, and it is only as the entire matter of it is apprehended as growing forth from that in this central view, that any part or portion of it can ever be rightly apprehended under any other view.

5. We are bound thus to allow full scope and range to the Messianic title *Son of God*, in our conception of Christ and His work. We may not narrow it into the notion of a mere official dignity; we may not resolve it into the character of a pale Gnostic abstraction. It must be allowed to condition for us practically the height and depth, the length and breadth of the Christian redemption. This redemption can be no accident or after-thought in the economy of creation. It is no figure of speech simply, to parallelize the new creation, as St. Paul does, with the old. It is only our miserably low way of thinking of Christ, that can ever tempt us to any such thought. The principle of the two creations is the same, and the end therefore, here as elsewhere, must have in it not only all, but more than all, the cosmical significance of the beginning. Only the "first-born of every creature" (Col. i. 15, 18) could become also the "first-born from the dead;" the Father being pleased thus "that in Him *all* fulness should dwell." The predestination of grace in this way antedates the predestination of nature, having had place in Christ, we are told (Eph. i. 4), "before the foundation of the world." Grace in such view is older than nature, deeper than nature, more comprehensive than na-

ture. Christ is the alpha and omega of both, and of both joined together as one. He descended, as the Redeemer of the world, *into the lowest parts of the earth*, that He might ascend up in His work far above all heavens, and so fill all things. The powers of the kingdom of heaven in His hand take hold on the deep places of the earth, the lowest foundations of the world's being and life. They are cosmogonic, world-historical, and world-teleologic in the profoundest and inmost sense of these terms, ending at last in the "new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

6. All this, we say, belongs to Christ as the Son of God; but in all this we are bound again to see and own in Him at the same time, in its full unbroken force, the Messianic dignity of the *Son of Man*. Only as thus gathering up into Himself the absolute and last sense of humanity, could He be at once the deepest and highest sense of the world, the alpha and omega of the world's life. He took upon Him the nature of man; had a real human birth; grew in wisdom and virtue as He grew in years; was tempted and tried as we are, only without sin; as a man, wrestled with the curse of sin that lay upon our general race, with death and with him that had the power of death; as a man, triumphed on the cross, went down into hades, rose again on the third day, and finally ascended up on high, leading captivity captive; where He sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and from whence He shall come again, as a man, to judge the quick and the dead (Matt. xxvi. 64; Acts xvii. 31; Rev. i. 7). Through all these stages, and under all these aspects, His humanity challenges our full unfaltering acknowledgment and faith; and the whole power of the Gospel for us depends on our power to communicate with it as an earnest reality in this way.

7. True man, without sin, and yet at the same time true God, as our Catechism puts it; or as it runs in the old Athanasian Creed: "God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and man of the substance of His mother, born in the world; perfect God, and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." That is the great

mystery of godliness, the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, "which, except a man believe truly and firmly," we are told, "he cannot be saved."

8. Such *believing* is determined directly and immediately by the authority of its object, before all power of understanding the nature and constitution of the mystery itself which is thus embraced. The apprehension of faith is not from knowledge, but in order to knowledge. The fact of the Trinity manifested through the fact of the Incarnate Son of God, goes before the dogma of the Trinity comprehended theoretically in the dogma of the Incarnation; and the faith of the Church was sure of both facts in the beginning, as we know, long before the sense of either was brought to any clear dogmatic expression. And thus it is that universally true Christian faith regards primarily Christ Himself, and not any doctrine of Christ; although Christ is at once for it again the root of all right doctrine, as well as the principle of all right life. To believe in Christ as very God and very man, it is not necessary that I should be able in the first place to see *how* the Divine can be thus inwardly and organically joined with the human in His person. I may feel the full force of the fact as it confronts me in the evangelical history, without being able to understand it. Theological science has not yet been able to express it in full; perhaps will never be able to do so in this world. It is a study even for angels; and how then should it be otherwise than largely incomprehensible for men? But faith here waits in no sense for theological science. It finds the whole Gospel in the personal Christ Himself, and finds it to be here at the same time the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation.

9. The saving power of faith lies thus in what it embraces, which is ultimately always "Christ come in the flesh," and not in any worth of faith itself otherwise considered. Its whole worth holds in its office of apprehending in a real way the objective revelation which God has been pleased to make of Himself in His Son Jesus Christ; which revelation, thus apprehended, Christ Himself assures us (John xvii. 3), is nothing

less than life eternal. The Christian salvation in this way, while it ends in subjective experience, draws all its force primarily from realities which are beyond and high above this experience. There can be no true experimental piety in the Christian sense, that is not the product of these heavenly and supernatural realities, working upon the soul and taking hold upon the life from their own objective sphere. The objectivities of the Gospel, as we may call them, are in this way of more account than its subjectivities. They are emphatically those "powers of the world to come," that are spoken of in the Epistle to the Hebrews as entering into all Christian experience; powers, which flow down into men from above, issuing from Christ, the Lord of life and glory, and mediated for the apprehension of faith by the power of the Holy Ghost through the word and sacraments. Forth out from the prison-house of self, and away from the transitory, perishing show of things seen and temporal, through the aspect or look of faith continually turned toward Jesus, the great forerunner and champion of the Christian faith; that is the wisdom of the saints, the virtue of the just, and the only law of deliverance from this present evil world. "For this is the victory that overcometh the world," according to St. John, "even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (1 John v. 4, 5).

10. Let us consider well, then, that we may always firmly hold fast, what is the true order of nature and grace, the right relation of earth to heaven, or of things which are seen and temporal to things which are unseen and eternal. We have to do here in our present life with two worlds. Our communication with one, the world of matter, is by sense and science based on sense; our communication with the other, the world of spirit, is by faith and knowledge proceeding from faith. The two worlds, of course, are with God one system, and in this view there can be no contradiction ultimately between the truths of natural science and the truths of faith; between the economy of the life that now is, and the economy of the life to come. They must be at last, we know perfectly well, one economy. But they are

not this at once for our present apprehension. On the contrary, they seem to be widely disparate orders of existence, that are in painful conflict on all sides, one with the other; so that it has been through all ages the great problem of life, how to harmonize their deep-toned discord. In the bosom of Christianity, especially, this conflict is brought to its fullest force and consciousness. It is the conflict here between nature and the supernatural, between science and faith, the history of which runs through all the Christian centuries; but the full crisis of which seems to have been reached only in our own time. Now it has become emphatically the burden of the world's universal life, the question of all questions for our universal modern civilization. It is moving the thunders of the Vatican in one way, and stirring the depths of all Protestantism in another way. It is taking hold of politics as well as religion; kings, princes, parliaments and statesmen are sorely troubled with its presence. All our science, all our business, all our education are entangled in the mighty dilemma one way or another, and have no power any more to hold themselves aloof from its practical challenge.

This it is, my dear young friends, that forms, beyond all other considerations, the grand and solemn interest of the period in which you are called to live and work in the world, and that more than all else, to my own mind, throws an awful responsibility prospectively on your future lives. The critical struggle between the terrestrial and the supernal, to which I have now been directing your attention, is one in which you must all from this time forward, as children of your time and age, take more or less active part. You cannot be neutral in the warfare. It is too broad and deep for that. Not to be on the side of the Lord here, is to be on the side of Satan.

How faith and science are to be ultimately harmonized, I am not prepared to say. It is not necessary, it seems to me, that we should be able to solve the question in full in our present state. There are, however, four general propositions in the case, which we are bound to assert and maintain:

First. The conflict between the two spheres, as the world now stands, is not imaginary only, but most positively real, and

it is growing in terrible significance every day. It has not been decided and ended yet, either on one side or on the other, and to ignore it is but the trick of the ostrich hiding her head in the sand to escape the hand of her pursuer.

Secondly. Science is not required to do blind homage to the authority of faith, exercised over it in an outward, mechanical way, according to the modern ultramontane theory of the Church of Rome.

Thirdly. Faith must not be required, on the other hand, to follow passively the authority of science, according to the fond view of the Spencers, Darwins, and Huxleys of our day; the modern *Weltanschauung* in general, as it is called in Germany, by which naturalism and humanitarianism are made to take the place of the old supernatural faith altogether, and Christianity is found resolving itself into a new moral creation springing up from the earth, instead of a new spiritual creation in Christ Jesus, coming down from heaven.

Fourthly. Then we are bound, and for our faith also it is possible, to reverse this order of looking at the world, and so to organize our scheme of thought and life, that the earthly shall be felt with us to depend upon the heavenly, instead of the heavenly upon the earthly.

This does not mean any such wilful immolation of natural reason and conscience on the altar of religion, as the modern Jesuitic theory of Rome demands. But it does mean that the principle of the Christian faith, as supernatural, shall be regarded as independent of the principle of all mere natural life and science; and that in the relation of the two principles to each other, moreover, the first shall be held to be of higher authority always than the second, because in fact coming before this in the true *idea* of the world, however seeming to come after it in the actual world-process. In other words, the only true ultimate order both of essential being and of knowledge, in the general relation of the world of nature to the world of spirit, is in reality not from below upward, but from above downward—not a scaling of the heavens by the powers of the earth, but a flowing down upon the earth of the powers of heaven. That, therefore, is the only law of harmony in the end be-

tween nature and the supernatural, between the human and the divine (illustrated and enforced by universal analogy in the natural creation itself); and faith, as independent of science and greater than science, consists just in the power of seeing and owning this, whether it be able at the same time or not able, to see in what way actually the claims of science are to be reconciled with its demands. If need be, faith can afford to wait for the final and full resolution of that "conflict of ages," till these outward heavens shall pass away as a scroll, and this panoramic time-vision shall lose itself at last in the light of the world that lies beyond time.

Need I say that the principle of Christian faith in this independent character, is not an abstract thought of any kind; the idea of the Absolute or Unconditioned in the sense of Kant or Sir William Hamilton, or that pure nescience which regards the infinite as the simply unknowable and unknown, in the sense of Herbert Spencer and the modern Humanitarian school generally? The principle plants itself, not on an abstraction, but on the very inmost reality of the world's actual being, which it is just the province and the special power of faith then (in distinction from sense, Heb. xi. 1-3) to authenticate and make sure to our human consciousness.

This objective reality is nothing other than the word of God, which is present as a living power in all divine revelation, as it has been spoken at sundry times and in divers manners through ages past by the prophets.

It is of His word in such wide general view God Himself speaks, Is. lv. 8-11, where He says: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways. As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth; it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

It is of the word in the same broad sense that St. Peter also speaks (1 Pet. i. 23-25), where he says of Christians that they are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." To which he adds immediately: "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you."

But what the divine word is in such supernatural and really objective view comes ultimately to its full, absolute sense and force, as we know, only in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; who is the Word Incarnate, the Divine Personal Logos, the eternal Son of God, incorporated into the very life of the world through union with our fallen nature, and made to be thus the Son of Man, for the great work of man's redemption. And here it is emphatically, therefore, that the grand descending order of God's creation comes fully and overwhelmingly into view, stultifying and turning into contempt the humanitarian imagination of an earth-born or earth-produced heaven in every shape and form.

"Ye are from beneath," we hear Him say; "I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world. I said therefore that ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins" (John viii. 23, 24).

And so in our text: "No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven."

This is the Christian *Weltanschauung*, in difference from every world scheme that starts from below, from the premises of mere nature, from the study of man as the highest out-birth simply of the world in its present state, and claims the right then of measuring the possibilities of the infinite and eternal by the rules of science drawn from this empirical and purely terrestrial sphere.

And who will dare to say that this stand-point of faith, found directly and immediately in the historical heaven-descended fact

of Jesus Christ (the deepest truth of the world, if Christ Himself be true), is less rational or sure, either for the right understanding of life, or for the right use of life, than the posture of science undertaking to scan or scale the spiritual heights of creation from any lower position?

Say not, that this supernatural, heaven-descended fact is itself, since Christ has returned to heaven, no other now than a theological theory or doctrine. It is still before us as an ever-living fact in the evangelical history, and it lives also through the ages in the faith of the holy Catholic Church. We have it in the Apostles' Creed. That Creed depends in no way on science. It is at once and in its own right, the vision of what is highest, and therefore deepest also, in the constitution of the world's life, flowing down directly from God the Father through Christ, as the power of a new creation needed in this way to complete the sense of the old.

Here, then, is the great practical issue to which we are brought by our subject: the issue of ages, which, I have said before, is upon our own time, perhaps, as on no previous time, and the full solemnity of which you are now called to meet in passing out into the world. The conflict between unbelieving science and faith, between nature and the supernatural, between the powers of what St. Paul calls "this present evil world" and the "powers of the world to come;" in one word, between the spirit of anti-christ, denying that Christ is come in the flesh, and the spirit of true faith, confessing this great mystery of godliness; this conflict, I say, which underlies so profoundly the seething, tumultuating forces of the time, is one in which you also are now called to take active side and part, and which you have no power to escape.

Let me urge upon you then the importance of not throwing yourselves forth upon the open sea of life, in these circumstances, without the ballast of firmly established principle; without the compass of heaven-directed intelligence and thought; without the rudder of a resolute Christian purpose and will; only to be at the mercy of all winds and waves, and to float hither and thither with any current into which you may

happen to fall. That would be indeed unworthy of your education, and might well cause us to feel that our labor bestowed upon you had been in vain. But I hope and trust better things of you, though I thus speak; and therefore it is that I call upon you on this occasion, to look the question before you squarely in the face, and to meet it at once with a full and clear-minded decision.

In the language of Joshua's farewell charge to the tribes of Israel, let me say to you now, in this parting address: "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve;" and let your right election, made now and here, stand as the solemn memorial of a covenant between you and God, to be remembered in all time to come. Before you are the two *Weltanschauungen*, the two great world schemes, to which I have been directing your attention at the present time: the Humanitarian theory of thought and life on the one hand, making spirit the outbirth of nature,—the celestial, the sublimation simply of the terrestrial; and on the other hand the theory of Christ and Christianity, and of the Apostles' Creed, resolving the highest life of the world into the down-flowing life of heaven. In the face of this alternative, let me ask, what think ye of Christ? Whose son is He? "Whom say ye," He asks of you Himself, "that I the Son of Man am?" Here is the test at last of all true Christianity, whether doctrinal or practical. See that the right answer to it, as of old with Nathanael and Simon Peter, be with you also the one glorious guiding star of your lives.

"Do not err, my beloved brethren. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures" (James i. 16–18). "Ye, therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked" (the naturalistic, humanitarian scoffers of the age), "fall from your own steadfastness. But grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To Him be glory both now and forever. Amen." (2 Pet. iii. 17, 18).

ART. II.—THE OLD AND THE NEW.*

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, A. M., IRWIN, PA.

IN our progress through the world we are at every turn confronted both with things that are old and with things that are new. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say, that we stand in the old, and the new is constantly pressing itself on us, urging its claims. The reason of this is the particular condition or manner in which the race came into being.

It came into being, not like Pallas Athene, who, according to the Greeks, sprung from the head of Zeus, a full-grown goddess, thoroughly armed and equipped. This would be monstrous according to all we know of nature. No living thing ever so comes into existence. There is always first the acorn, then the oak; first the egg, then the bird; the child, then the man. So did the race, which is a living organism, come into existence as an infant, if not in outward form, at least as to knowledge and attainments.

But if the Greeks meant to declare that from the head of the king of the gods and men came forth into external realization the idea that involved in it from the beginning the possibility of great powers and wisdom, their goddess would be no longer a myth, but a reality. For Adam came from the hands of his Creator with all the capacities of the race wrapped up in his being as the image and likeness of God.

Now as the acorn cannot become an oak, nor the child a man, without taking into itself new substances from the soil and from the air, neither can the race come to its maturity but by this receiving and assimilating things from every world, material, mental, spiritual, in which it has its being. Yet in all this process it is the same life all along that is taking up these

* Address to the Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College, at the Annual Commencement, 1872.

new elements, having not a single break anywhere along the line between the first man and the people of to-day, notwithstanding all the changes through which it has passed. We cannot conceive of man as man coming into existence or continuing in existence in any other way. Reason, which is his peculiar gift, is of such a nature that it requires its possessor to take in things only gradually, and not by any external force. It is the only way in which they can become parts of his conscious life and enter into the constitution of his being. There is a marked difference just here between reason in man and instinct in the animal. Instinct is a dark power that leads each and every full-grown animal to the full extent of all that is involved in its kind. The lion and the robin pursue their life to-day as robins and lions did from the beginning. The savage, too, in whose breast reason has become almost identical with instinct, may live as the mere animal. But before man, of a reasonable soul subsisting, is spread a wider field. The matter of creation and the mind of the Creator are brought to bear upon him, constituted as he is of mind and matter to respond. The universe is vast, the Maker is infinite. No single individual, no single age, can possibly explore the whole. Each can only do its own share, and enjoy as much as has been traversed at the time. It will require the whole race the whole time to reach the goal.

It is clear that mankind has gone, and is still going, through a process of this kind in its apprehension and *enjoyment* of the world, of self, and of God. If man *is* the Grecian goddess that presides over philosophy, poetry, oratory, agriculture, all the sciences and arts, both beautiful and industrial, he has, under the inspiration of Deity, all these in his own hands, for his own development and well-being. And in all these he is continually taking the new into the old.

There is the same necessity for raiment, and the same kind of materials to make it out of, now as at the beginning, yet how superior are our clothes to-day, so neat and convenient, so artistic in shape, color, and texture, notwithstanding all the vagaries of the changing styles, to the loose tunic and flowing

toga of the ancient Romans, and these again to the aprons of fig-leaves and coats of skins worn by Adam and Eve. Think of our modern residences with their many conveniencies, enjoyed not by princes and millionaires alone, but by thousands of even moderate means; then those of not many centuries back when clean straw on the floor every morning was considered a luxury; and then again of the caves and movable tents of still earlier years. Men will travel, and nations will communicate. But the rapid car and swift ship of to-day will carry one as far in one hour as the slow coach and storm-tossed vessel of yesterday in twenty-four. The news of the firing upon Fort Sumter and the surrender at Appomattox, or of Napoleon III. moving towards the Rhine, and the fall of Sedan is, in a moment, sent, by the touch of a finger, throughout the civilized world. But formerly when the Scotch would warn of the approach of their English foes, or the English announce the coming of the Invincible Armada from Spain, they had to climb to the tops of mountains and light up their beacon fires from peak to peak; and the watchman of Clytemnestra, according to the poets, passed weary years, exposed upon the house-top, to catch the first glimpse of the fires across the Ægean that signaled the fall of Troy.

And as to the knowledge that the mind seeks after for its own sake—a knowledge that ennobles, and that leads to the eternal Mind—of how much wider a field is it now the master than when it first commenced its explorations. Then men sought to find one general principle or substance as the origin or basis of the whole universe. Some looked upon air as that basis, or one of the other three elements; others, the four elements combined. Some found it in number, others in indivisible atoms floating through space; some in incessant change, and some in an invisible agency identified with the universe as its soul. But these speculations were the womb of the sciences, which came to their birth in due order, and then gradually grew to their present maturity. Step by step, by the continued coming of the new into the old, mankind has attained to the present clear comprehension of things, as to quantity

and number, their movement in mass and molecule, and their composition and affinities, of vegetable, animal, and human life, of the human soul, and of God. From the time that the earth was believed to be flat, and the centre of the universe, having all the other bodies revolving about it, to the present knowledge of the heavens, there needed to be a Thales, a Pythagoras, Hipparchus, Ptolemy, Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, Herschell. Oriental philosophy, in which everything was referred to the divinities of nature, was followed by the Greek speculations just mentioned on the origin of the material universe. But Socrates arose and turned attention to the contemplation of man himself, to lead him to virtue, which he made synonymous with wisdom. Plato taught the origin of the human soul, as existing at first happy in the divine presence, but now fallen into a cavern of darkness open to the light only on one side, in which it sees only the shadows of things, the substances being all without. By discipline it will be able to regain that original enjoyment of substantial truth and bliss, of which it has now only dim reminiscences. Aristotle directed his energies to the observation of facts, and by reasoning logically thereon aimed to arrive at the truth underlying all appearances. When Christianity had furnished the true substance for thought as reason furnishes the forms, the Scholastics and Mystics of the Middle Ages endeavored either by Aristotelian logic or Platonic discipline to come to the full apprehension of the revealed truth. By these the way was opened for the independent and vigorous observation of the processes of the human mind in these modern days, which, productive as it is of various systems of thought, from the empiricism of Bacon and idealism of Descartes to the eclecticism of Cousin and positivism of Comte, is leading men to the only ground of the truth of the material, intellectual, and spiritual worlds, the divine-human person of the great Revelator, Jesus Christ. And the present distinct knowledge also of God, of His person, of His attributes, the Maker, the Redeemer, the Sanctifier, was reached only by successive revelations of the Deity Himself, from the incomplete conceptions of the Jews,

the debasing ideas of Gentiles, and æsthetic imaginations of Greeks and Romans.

But there is work of another kind for the race to do. A disturbing force has come in, which interferes with its progress all along. This must be met and overcome. There are many that switch off on side-tracks; some may return again into the main line, but others go off at a great angle and perish. The world is full of tombs, many of which must be marked "unknown," in which lie buried the false notions and visionary schemes of men whose ashes are mingled with them. We know only how many inventions, plans, views, in our own day, fall still-born at our feet. If any have come down to us from the past, it is because they served to bring out the truth, or were kept alive by their mere opposition. Cousin says, "All that is in human nature passes into the movement of civilization, but it is the excellence of history to take out and throw away all that is not necessary and essential." How can it be otherwise with error since it has no real principle of life, and when once "wounded writhes in pain, and dies, amid his worshipers."

King Henry of Navarre conceived the idea of forming Europe into a grand republic of fifteen States to put an end to their continual wars, and was ready to join his army to execute his purpose, when he fell by the hand of an assassin. Fourier proposed his socialistic theory of grouping people by the two thousand together in one community and building, and all these communities under one government and language, all to be bound together in the highest condition of happiness and prosperity by giving free scope to all human desires and passions. Towards the close of his life he waited patiently at a certain hour every day, expecting some rich or influential man to offer himself to carry out the scheme. No such patron ever came, and his few followers are said to have hastened his death by their futile efforts at realization. Think of the vain attempts to discover perpetual motion in the department of mechanics. For the last two thousand years, hundreds have wasted their best energies of body and mind at this wonderful

delusion; they and their machines going down to the dust together. Many are at it to-day while we speak. In ancient times men toiled with their crucibles and alembics to discover the philosopher's stone, that great secret of nature, by which the baser metals might be transmuted into gold, and the elixir of life, by which the aged might renew their youth and beauty. Or, they studied the stars, with the view of predicting future events and foretelling the fortunes of men by the position of these heavenly bodies. Even Kepler, who discovered the three great laws of planetary motion, that bear his name, believed in a connection between the position of planets and the disposition of persons born under them. But alchemy and astrology were not altogether fruitless, for they were the fathers of the sciences of chemistry and astronomy, by which we have not only a pleasurable insight into bodies terrestrial, and a view of bodies celestial, but profit also in satisfying many wants of our daily life. In the Middle Ages Christian nations set out on the task of rescuing the sepulchre of Jesus and the holy land from the hands of the polluting Saracens. They hoped thereby to benefit the souls of their own people, and extend the triumphs of the Cross. Intense must have been the emotion when they caught the first glimpse of the Holy City, and in triumph may Godfrey of Bouillon have reigned there for a while. But no one could count the graves of the thousands of poor wretches, as well as of disciplined soldiers, that fell by hunger, fatigue, pestilence, and sword, along the highways of Hungary and Bulgaria, and in the plains of Asia Minor; and to this day the birth place of Christianity is under the heel of the oppressing Turk and overrun by the depredating Arab. But is the religion of Him, whose earthly career was there begun and there ended, on that account, weakened or destroyed? Instead, the crusades led to the building up of His kingdom by enlarging the contracted views of its builders, by causing it to shed forth its light in other lands and to receive theirs in return, by the enfranchisement of the human mind from ignorance and prejudice, the promotion of commerce and the re-

vival of literature, an end which the crusaders had not the wisdom to foresee, nor the power to design.

Utopian schemes and false notions like these are continually arising, and every age has a work to do not only in developing certain phases of the truth, but also in eliminating particular errors, or turning them to account. This is, in fact, the great work of humanity, the problem of history. And, whilst perhaps it is true that the creature can never arrive at the full measure of the Creator and His works, there is yet a definite point to be reached—a point that *will* be reached—the truth in its wholeness, a free and happy coinciding of the mind with all things, divine and human, physical and spiritual, even such as are not now dreamt of in our philosophy. The world is not drifting blindly on a sea of chance. "There is a divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will." God *is* in history, and humanity is *not* a lie. He is unerringly guiding it through the marshes of its own making to the solid ground of perfection beyond, to which it instinctively aspires.

But that goal is yet afar off. There are too many contradictions, contentions, differences, pains, to allow us to think otherwise. Hence, while we hold on to the old, we must lay hold also of the new. If we quit the old, there will be at every turn a new creation. If we reject the new, there can be no going forward. These propositions are axiomatic.

Yet on these very points there are two classes of individuals, and of nations. There are some who love the old because it is old, and would reject the new; there are some who love the new because it is new, and would let go the old. Many are adverse to change, and say, "What was true for our fathers, and good enough for them, is true and good enough for us." Others, with restless and impatient spirits, are always sighing for something new, and readily fall in with it when it comes, be it good or bad. The aged are apt to belong to the former class; to the latter, the young. So with nations. China, more than four thousand years old, is still clinging with wonderful tenacity to customs and views handed down from generations that extend back beyond the reach of history. While the people of

our own country, which is only now making preparations to celebrate its one-hundredth anniversary, possess the striking characteristic of going after something new, whether it be table-turning, a patent churn, gold in California, oil in Pennsylvania, or silver in Colorado.

Perhaps, in view of errors in the past, and errors yet to come, one would ask himself, what is the world to do under the circumstances? Must it hate the old, and love the new; or hold to the one, and despise the other? If, however, we look at the old, that is true in distinction from the false, and the new that is true in distinction from the false, the question cannot arise. It is not a matter for us to determine, it is a matter that determines itself. The old is true only when it takes in the new; the new is true only when, in some sense or other, it grows out of the old. This true old must, and will all the time remain, this true new must and will all the time come in, whether individuals here and there resist or not; if there be any truth in humanity, or power in its Maker.

In this view, it is no doubt beneficial and wisely ordered that society is made up of both the aged and the young, and the world of both classes of men and nations. Were it not so, there might be either a standing stock still, or a speedy dashing to pieces against rocks. A ship must have both its sails and its ballast; the one to make it go, the other to keep it steady; and ballast and sails must be properly adjusted to bring the vessel in good time and safely into port. Where there are progressive men and conservatives in due proportion, there is mankind moving on with sufficient speed and security to the great goal. It is now nearly thirty years since Morse applied to Congress for an appropriation to aid him in introducing a new thing—the magnetic electric telegraph. Previously repulsed by England and France, his last hope was in America. But even here, the last day of the session had arrived—March the 3d, 1843—and late at night Morse retired to bed expecting in the morning to return home with a disappointed heart. But the representatives of the people were in the meantime still considering the matter, amidst much merriment and ridicule.

One proposed an amendment granting aid for experiments in Mesmerism; another in Millerism, to test whether the world would not soon come to an end; a third proposed a telegraph to the moon to find out how the people were getting along there! And just before the session expired, at the midnight hour, by a vote of eighty-nine to eighty-three, the desired aid was granted! Eighty-nine to eighty-three! There was need indeed of the *eighty-three* as custodians at the gates, to prevent the expending of time, money, and energy on vain and impracticable things; but there was greater need of the *eighty-nine* to give to the world the means by which its people can communicate over its vast domains as but one family dwelling in one house, and thus make a wondrous stride in the onward march of civilization.

It is not often that these two principles are found duly proportioned in one person. Most people are inclined either to the one, or the other. But just to the extent that the one predominates unduly over the other, will the individual suffer loss. Happy is the man who is able to adhere to the true old, and welcome the true new in the every-day matters of his life! It may indeed be difficult sometimes in these little matters, to determine on the proper course; but, in the mighty concerns of humanity, it is determined for us, over our heads. There are men raised up here and there, each in a particular sphere, and perhaps, too, of different grades, who gather up into themselves all the legitimate fruits of the past, and are leaders to help the race on to future advancements and triumphs.

"The history of what man has accomplished in the world," says Carlyle, "is at bottom the history of the great men who have worked here"—Plato, Mohammed, Shakspeare, Luther, Napoleon. These possess not only the soul of the old and of the new, but a soul in themselves, by which to carry into execution. They may be baffled here, they will try it there. A spring of water may be covered up with loads of earth, but it will only break out at another place. Morse, filled with the soul of his great invention, would not be defeated, though he had to go from country to country. Copernicus may have hesitated to

publish his discovery to the world for fear of the Church, but still the book containing the results of his efforts was published at last, even though the first copy was placed in his hands just a few hours before he died. The famous saying of Galileo is significant for all time. Other one-sided conservatives may become the laughing-stock of succeeding ages, besides the inquisition that persecuted Galileo and compelled him to retract, but the soul of the great man cannot but declare, even though it be in a whisper, "The world still moves." Men and nations may unconsciously stand in the way, or with open eyes run right against the clearly revealed will of Heaven, but they must either have their eyes opened, disengage themselves from the meshes of their own error, and fall in with the true current of history, as Constantine, who relinquished his heathenism, embraced the cross, and himself gave a favorable turn to the course of human affairs; or else they must perish from the way like the Indians of our own forests, who refused to submit to the advancing tide of civilization, or like the Canaanites of old before the avenging arm of Israel.

Perhaps it would be difficult to tell what beneficial effect upon the development of the race some great men have had. Mohammed started millions of his fellow-men into what is evidently a side track, there being at least half as many Mohammedans to-day as Christians. How different from a Socrates, who proclaimed principles and views that still live in the world, or even an Odin, whose descendants or followers introduced fresh vigor into the present civilized nations. But there was a time when Moslems were the enlightened teachers of Europe, in the darkness of the middle ages, and were conservators of the arts and sciences, and the time may yet come, when the one hundred and fifty millions of Mohammedans, as well as the four hundred millions of Buddhists, will contribute something more to the general stream of progress, as it is now under the control of three hundred millions of Christians. And who knows but that, with all the rapid strides of Western nations, the staid old empires of the East, with their myriads of subjects, will yet come by the direction of Providence, to

play an important part in the drama of the world before the last fall of the curtain!

What is the civilization of the present day but the old life of the race that has come down to us through the ages, made to flow on increasingly by the new supplies it received as it passed through the hands of the several nations and tongues? Or would things be the same now in the world even if there had been no Rome, no Greece, no Persia, no Babylon? An impenetrable mist hangs over the nations of antiquity, with the exception of a narrow ray of light from the book of divine revelation. As the mist gets rarer we begin to see, at a single glance almost, the dim outlines of Egypt, Babylon, Nineveh, Sidon and Tyre. Here was life; commercial activity, and knowledge of sciences, and practical use of the arts, glass, purple, letters, writing, warlike power and ambition, wealth and luxury, magnificence and grandeur, while other parts of the earth were either without inhabitants, or were lost in ignorance and sloth. Has this old civilization perished, and does it lie in ruins with the crumbled walls and mouldering rubbish of these great cities? Egypt once stood alone as the power and light of the world, but it is now shrouded in a pall of Moslem darkness; Sidon and Tyre carried the products of their skill into all parts of the inhabited world, and received rich returns, but the one is now an insignificant town of a few thousand inhabitants, and the other a village of poor fishermen. The very site of Babylon, once so powerful and magnificent, is still a disputed point. But just as the labors of a St. Paul, and of a St. John are enjoyed in Christendom to-day, although the particular churches which they established with great zeal have long since been dissolved, and the very same territory is again missionary ground; so Egypt, Phœnicia, Assyria still live in us; and live in us too both as regards the inward divine substance and the outward human forms of our modern Christian civilization. For their power was brought to bear upon the Jews, who were the agents in preparing the one, as it was directly inherited by the Greeks and Romans, the chief agents in preparing the other. Only call to mind how the Jews came

into contact with them along the whole line of their history—with Egypt, because their great leader and lawgiver was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and made due account thereof in his divine calling—with Phœnicia, when Hiram, king of Tyre, furnished both artists and artists' materials for the building of Solomon's temple, in which the true God was worshiped—and Babylon, when the flower of Judah was carried thither as captives, and there acquired riches and attained to high positions in the State.

But the old life of those ancient nations reaches us more directly in the stream of history outside of revelation. Persia, though extending its roots as far back as Egypt or Babylon, did not emerge from the region of obscurity and fable, or figure much in the world, until it gained the physical force to subdue Babylon, Phœnicia, and Egypt. But then its glory began. Persepolis, its capital, was called the "glory of the East," with which it is said no other city could be compared in beauty or in wealth. If the former kingdoms were ready to perish, their work being done, not so their work. That was taken up by another stock that had been preparing for it, and that needed it, and yet that could infuse into it new vigor. Thus far all was in the hands of Ham and Shem, if Egypt was founded by Menes or Mizraim, the son of Ham, and Babylon by Nimrod, his grandson; Nineveh by Asshur, the son of Shem; and now Persia, the conqueror of the whole, by Shem's descendants. Canaan thus became the servant of Shem, in secular as in sacred history—but *Japheth* had yet to come to dwell in the tents of Shem. He was all along cotemporaneous, but his powers lay dormant, in the uncultivated nations that peopled the North and West of Asia and the most parts of Europe. The oldest city of Greece was founded probably only a few hundred years after Babylon, and still nearer the time of the commercial Sidon. The people are represented as being extremely rude. But Cecrops and his colony came from Egypt about the age of Moses and built Athens. From Egypt or Phœnicia Cadmus is said to have come, built the Grecian Thebes, and introduced an alphabet of sixteen letters. These

appear to be two facts among the many myths of the early history of Greece, and they show that already thus early this country got a taste of civilization. Yet it is as remarkable as well known that the age of fable passed over into authentic history, history that begins to tell in the progress of the race, in which the ancient Greeks were such great workers, only from the time that the powerful Persians came from the East with their invading hosts. Then began the glorious era of Greece, the age of Miltiades, the hero of Marathon, Themistocles and Aristides, of Salamis, Leonidas, of Thermopylæ, Cimon and Pericles. Then flourished the arts of civilization —the old arts, but now quickened into a new glow by the Grecian mind and heart. These arts flourished, be it remembered, both when the martial and patriotic spirit of the people was at its highest, when their renowned military leaders were statesmen and philosophers as well, and when this spirit began to decline by the introduction of Asiatic manners and luxuries, and by the exhaustion of their physical force by intestine feuds. Then came the days of the empire, and Alexander of Macedon appeared upon the stage. Defeating the *Persians* at the Granicus and Issus, reducing the obstinate *Tyre*, receiving the homage of *Egypt*, and again slaughtering the hosts of Darius at Arbela, and utterly putting an end to the Persian monarchy, and bringing Asia under the power of Europe—a supremacy which it has ever since maintained—came to *Babylon*, the Babylon of Nimrod, and would make it the seat of his vast empire. But no! that could not be. Even an Alexander could not turn back the wheels of history. The glory of Babylon had departed, and the light of the world had centred at Athens. In Babylon Alexander died. But not so his work. His empire indeed fell to pieces, but it was only the breaking of the shell; the kernel remained to vegetate, and to bless the world. Just as Charlemagne, a thousand years later—whose empire embraced France, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, and parts of Italy and Spain, but fell asunder at his death—gave an impetus to learning and religion that was felt by all succeeding generations; so did Alexander the Great, by

his rapid victorious career, open highways among the nations, along which Grecian literature and learning traveled in company with the Grecian language, to and fro, settling down here and there, securing thus the continuation of the true development of the race, when Greece itself would be worn out and dead.

And so it has come down to us. But not without passing through the hands of yet another people to receive new power and glory. In the very century in which Greece was the great light in philosophy and the arts, Rome was only getting itself ready to bear the world's life. This it did by working up its own native powers in the way of regulating the relations between the two classes of society—patrician and plebeian — and in general of self-government. After the long reigns of the kings down to the expulsion of the Tarquins, the Romans strengthened themselves in the narrow limits of their own city (and that too by the aid of wholesome laws received even now from *Greece*); then subdued their immediate neighbors, rose from their ashes to which they had been reduced by the Gauls, conquered Pyrrhus, destroyed their rival, Carthage (a city of *Phœnician* origin and enterprise), and thus made themselves masters of all lower Italy, and lords of the Mediterranean. But thus far all was mere physical power — external military vigor and public spirit — a very healthy and strong stock, however, to receive the grafts of mental and moral glory, for which it was now prepared. Greece was conquered by Roman arms, but Rome was conquered by Grecian heads. The civilization which the Greeks had so vigorously advanced by their investigations into the laws of mind and matter, and by their developing of the forms of beauty, the Romans cheerfully took from their hands, not merely to preserve it, but to turn it to practical account, in the State and in the individual, by infusing into it their own world-conquering energy and administrative power. Then followed the age of Cicero, Cæsar, Pompey, and the greatest empire of antiquity in the splendid reign of Cæsar Augustus.

Rome was then at its height. And just at this point, before

it began to decline, enervated by luxury, after the example of all its predecessors, the SUBSTANCE OF THE WORLD'S LIFE appeared as a speck in the little distant province of Judea! It was the Babe of Bethlehem, called the Son of God! It was God Himself become man to save the race of man! Here is the highest example of the true old and the true new. He did not destroy the old race and begin a new one in His own person, nor did He leave it to itself in the vain attempt to work out its own redemption; but, on the one hand, as the Son of man, He not only gathered up in Himself the life of humanity in a direct line from Mary to Adam, but was also ready now to lay hold of the cultivation and vigorous outward life of the Roman nation, which had come down through the ages; and, on the other hand, as the Son of God, introduced such new principles and powers as could in no other way have come in, but which kings and people waited for, and sought, but never found. This is the source of the civilization that is now flowing on, and the promise to Abraham is in process of fulfillment. "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

There is, however, a certain other element or power that we must make due account of, and that is, as we may call it, the power of *catastrophe*—such a commotion or shaking in human affairs as seems to overturn the old completely, and set up something altogether new. This appears to be sometimes the only means by which old errors and prejudices can be broken down, and men led into new fields which they never thought of entering before. But even in this case, the foundation will still be found to remain, though the superstructure be demolished—the tap root will still stand, though branches and trunk be severed. The gardener may cut the living bud from one stem to insert it into another, earthquake, fire, or water may destroy a city, war may desolate a nation, and a more fruitful tree, a more beautiful city, and a more prosperous nation arise, but it will be in each case still because of a blending of elements old and new. The earth gives evidence of having passed through a series of catastrophes, by which the

old order of things was disturbed and a new order brought about, but whether by progressive development, as some would have us believe, from the monad to the mammal, or by the creative power of the Almighty, every period was but the basis for its successor, all looking forward to the appearance of man, the highest order of creation. And even now there may be a waiting for another paroxysm in nature, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, the elements melt with fervent heat, and the earth and the works therein be burned up, but all this will be the mere working up of the old materials into the new heavens and the new earth, in which only those shall dwell who have, in the struggle for existence, reached a more perfect state of righteousness, by selecting the higher life of God in Christ. That life itself, as it is the highest example of the old and the new, is also the highest example of the power of catastrophe, inasmuch as it passed through the fearful shock of crucifixion and death into a glorified and exalted state. Yet did it possess the germ of that glorification from the beginning; and men must *now* partake of that glorified life before *they* can meet and overcome the power of death and the grave, and rise from their dust and ashes on the resurrection morn in glorious array.

The irruption of the barbarians from the North and from Asia was the cause of a terrible shock felt in Europe in the fourth and fifth centuries. Those numerous hordes, Goths, Huns, Vandals, and others, kept pushing each other, and coming down successively upon the old Roman Empire; and, with the destruction of the imperial city, seemed to have obliterated every mark of ancient civilization. What Alaric spared, Genseric destroyed. It was as if the whole old order was overturned, and a new order set up. It is certain that the foundations of modern society were then laid. But were not some of the old stones worked in with the new? What are the civilized nations of to-day but the vital blending of Roman development and barbarian blood? The one furnished the subject-matter, the other the new natural force to take and work it up. For a while, indeed, learning and religion were

in utter abeyance—it *was* a dark period in the history of humanity. But the schools of the Saracens and the cells of the monks afforded a refuge, until the storm was overpast, and the jarring elements had time to get themselves ready to take up both religion and learning, and bear them on.

Look at our own country and our own time. The institution of slavery was an all-pervading element in the social life of many of the States. Now a new condition of affairs in this direction has set in. That institution exists no more, and society must adapt itself to the change. And how was the change brought about? Not by way of gradual emancipation, nor by peaceful legislation, nor by expensive colonization, but by a great *catastrophe*—the catastrophe of arms, the shock of battle, by tears and blood. That man would have been regarded insane who would have proposed a law to take the two billions of money the war cost to pay for the slaves and set them free. By catastrophe alone could the thing be done. Neither party fought with direct reference to slavery; the one for independence, the other for the maintenance of the Union. This, President and Congress repeatedly declared to be the object of arms, emancipation was declared only as a measure of war, and involuntary servitude, except for crime, was constitutionally forbidden only after the close of the struggle. And yet this new state of affairs also had its roots in the old; in the earnest desire of some to get rid of it in any way, and in the Christian feeling of most people to get rid of it in some satisfactory way, according to the example set by other nations. And even now, the parties more immediately concerned are represented as being willing to accept the situation, provided they be politically reconstructed, and allowed to take their places in the Union, to add to its general wealth and prosperity, and share again its blessings.

The Church has suffered such shocks as well as the State. The agitation in the sixteenth century was of such a character as to lead many to suppose that the old Church was destroyed, root and branch, and a new one then and there established. Had that been the case, the new Church would be no Church

at all. Violent may have been the commotion, battles may have been fought with the tongue, and with the pen, and with the sword; and an improved state of things been seen after the blowing away of the smoke, yet must the Church of the Reformation be the necessary outgrowth of the old, whilst it is at the same time the introduction of the new, or it cannot be the legitimate continuation of the Church founded at the beginning. The old outward form remained, it is true, and remains to this day. But so has it always been the way. One kingdom would rise and flourish, be subdued by force of arms, hand its development to its successor, and yet long remain, even though but the ghost of its former self. So the Jews were the Church, and bore the world's life in a supernatural point of view, until the great Substance came; but when that Substance had come, and was perfected and glorified, then it became necessary to break up the old form, which was fearfully done when Jerusalem was destroyed, the Temple razed to the ground, the inhabitants suffering untold misery, and the remnant scattered into all the world. Scattered into all the world, but yet a separate, peculiar people, from the humblest dealer in ready-made clothing to the Rothschild bankers—the money monarchs of the world — not dead as human beings or makers of money, but dead as active agents in bearing the world's religious life. The Christian Church is the true continuation of the old Jewish, and not the modern Jewish, because it has both the old and the new. Had the Jewish leaders accepted the Messiah when He presented Himself, there might have been no Jewish church to-day — and had the authorities of the Church in the sixteenth century heeded the cry for a reformation in the head and members, there might have been no Roman church to-day, but only the church catholic. But in neither case was this done, and the catastrophe could not be avoided. The Roman may still exist and possess the old outward forms, but what of that, if so much of their substance is gone? The Jews remain to this day, and their ceremonies are more like those of Moses than ours, and their line of descent, according to the flesh, can be traced directly back to Abraham; but

what of that, if the life has assumed other forms, and made other men the true children of Abraham?

The Protestant substance coming out of the old had necessarily to develop for itself some new outward forms that were adapted to its case — just as Christianity had to do when it came out of Judaism, and that not by direct divine appointment, except in the case of the Word and the two Sacraments, but freely out of its own life as needed. But, in doing so, into what an apparently hopeless babel has Protestantism fallen! Something similar to the experience of the ancient Church, after the death of the Apostles and the days of persecution, when it suffered much from the different schools and tendencies that prevailed. See how one ecclesiastical organization unchurches another; how each one has its shibboleth—its decrees, its psalmody, its human name and authority, its conversion, its immersion, its tactual succession; how this one and that one considers itself the embodiment of all truth, waiting for all others to fall in with it, and leaving them in the mean time to the mercies of God, which are supposed to be more tender than its own can be. If into this bubbling mass of seeming confusion we pour also the contentions and pretensions of the Latin and Greek churches — for we see no reason why they should not be called upon to contribute to the long-prayed-for end, just as we may suppose that even the Jews are kept a separate people for the purpose of taking some further part when the fulness of the Gentiles has come in—we see no way of getting out of the cauldron at all, unavoidable as this boiling of the elements together in the present state of humanity may be, but by the natural interference of God in the way of *catastrophe*,—overturning, and overturning, and overturning, until the one-sided apprehensions of men, and their inborn prejudices, be shattered to pieces in the full light of the manifested truth. But if ever a better state of things in this world be brought about, by war, or by pestilence, or by famine, or by the wreck of matter and crush of worlds in the end, the roots thereof will be found to extend, through the longings of all earnest parties for an outward as well as an inward union,

way back to the personal unity of the divine Head, who prayed for His followers also, "That they all may be one."

The old, and the new! Without a proper relation to these two principles or elements, no *man* can be what he ought to be as an individual member of the race. Every one ought to be even with the times in which he lives. If he is behind, he suffers loss; if he is before, he is expending his energy without results. Only a few men are called and fitted by nature to lead the race into new things that are great and true. But every man who follows on intelligently, and keeps up, contributes to the general cause, and realizes in his own being and personal surroundings the natural delight that flows from a nearer and nearer approach to the great goal. That man surely stands in his own light who, notwithstanding Copernicus has lived, still believes that the sun revolves around the earth in twenty-four hours, as well as the man who cuts his fields of grain with the sickle instead of the reaper. No one need be afraid of the speculations of philosophers, the labors of men of science, or proposed improvements in the art of living, for in all these the Gamaliel principle prevails, "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." If a man break loose from the ranks of the old, and start out into side-paths, with the expectation of reaching the goal by more rapid and forced marches, he will surely miss the road altogether and lose his labor, unless he turn and come back again into the highway, in which all the nations are travelling—travelling indeed, in an important sense, in their *own conveyances*, but guided at the same time by the unerring hand of Him, whose intelligent will constitutes the laws that govern all movements, whether they be in the worlds of space, in the elements around us, or in the affairs of men. Many a one likes to hide himself in his own fixed views or habits, and thinks himself as safe there as the ostrich with only its head in the sand when pursued by the hunters. But prejudices, like sand, must finally give way before the measured tread of the soldiers of humanity, as they march on under the lead of their captains from conflict to

conflict. Individuals may grumble and growl at the slow progress made, and attempt to stimulate the speed by shadowy notions and visionary schemes, but they and their schemes must wither as the true light comes steadily up and shines upon them, like plants that have no depth of earth, and flourish briskly for a while, but wilt as the sun rises and pours upon them its beams. Parents perhaps would sometimes like to keep their child always a child, to enjoy its innocent prattle and baby ways, but they can neither stop its growth, if they would, nor cause it all of a sudden to become a man. The race was a child, it must yet become a man. No earthly power can stop the process. With a substratum of life that is the same all the way through from the beginning to the end, it will take in new things every day, and slough off or outgrow old sores and diseases, and reach at last the state of perfection; but every member thereof must buckle on his armor, take his place in the ranks, and fight, if he would share and enjoy the common triumph in the end.

The *State* also, and the Church, must be properly related to the old and the new. Each has had a history, which, in neither case, has yet come to an end. Or, is there a State, is there a Church, that is perfect? Show me a State, show me a Church that has no errors to correct, no further advancement to make, and you will show me a fossil. That State only is a firmly established one that is able to take in new elements at certain junctures on the basis of its old life. It is neither good for it to be subject to the whims of a capricious monarch, nor to be unalterable in its laws, like those of the Medes and Persians. In the one case it would be driven about at the mercy of the winds, in the other it would consign many a Daniel to the fury of wild beasts; in both cases it would be in danger of destruction. Provision must be made for the safe introduction of the new. The State must adapt itself to the growing wants of the people, and the laws must be subject to amendment, not suddenly or in a day, but in the secure manner provided for in our own Federal and State constitutions. Questions of reform are continually arising, from the tariff to woman's rights.

There must be no fear to meet them, even if it comes to the setting of a woman in the President's chair. For, while we might not fancy a Victoria Woodhull, there is *another* Victoria that *is* having a long and splendid reign over a prospering nation. These questions, as occasion require, must be considered and met by the people, led by their representative men, and upon their decision will depend, in a great measure, the future weal or wo of the Republic. It will not do to say, "let good enough alone;" for what is good enough for to-day may not be good enough for to-morrow. Rejection of a good measure may be as destructive as the adoption of a bad one. If King John of England had refused to sign the Magna Charta, that great bulwark of English liberty, it might have been as bad for his country, and for himself, as when Charles I., one of his successors, acted so indiscreetly as to attempt to arrest certain members of Parliament for the part they had taken in debate, and plunged the nation into civil war, and lost his own head!

And in order to this perpetuity still further, history teaches that there is power in the mingling of different nations and tongues—in new *blood*, as well as in new measures. One people seems to wear out or exhaust its natural force, and is either wholly supplanted by a new people, or is blended with them. While Russia, Austria, and Prussia are of comparatively recent origin, France and England, in which there is severally the commingling of different tribes or races, are the oldest of European monarchies, and still stand along with Germany at the head of modern civilization. It may be the salvation of our own country, in comparison with others on this continent, that it is the asylum of all the nations of the earth. Germans and Scandinavians, English and Scotch, Irish and Welsh, and others, are still pressing to our shores. The negroes of Africa are among us for some purpose, the Chinese from Asia are beginning to make their appearance, and even the American Indians, as they approach extermination, will leave of their blood behind. Let the nations come. Let them come in small numbers, be peacefully absorbed, receive the benefits

of the nation, and add their own in return. Or let them come in larger numbers, and create, if it must be, a period of partial chaos; out of the mingling of the old will arise a new, in which, as the extreme Western land, all the problems of the world will perhaps be finally solved.

The *Church*, too, to be safe and effective, must possess some elasticity. It must be elastic enough to take in all the new that is a legitimate outgrowth of the old, or it must break. To be wedded to particular forms and regulations, not divinely fixed and ordained, is to dwarf the feet of the Church as with Chinese iron shoes; to fall in suddenly with every fancy of religious enthusiasts, or speculating philosophers, without trying the spirits whether they be of God, is to commit the churches to the winds and waves without an anchor. Looking back into the past history of the church, we can clearly see, because it is past, what is truth in the midst of much error, and, standing firmly upon that, and in that, we need not fear to meet anything new that presents its head. If it be the true new, we will be able to take it in just as fast as led by men of genius, and as the due mixture of progressives and conservatives will allow. If this course be not pursued, the new wine, that will be made in spite of us, will burst the old bottles of unyielding forms and customs; and any particular church that refuses the well-made new wine may be a body indeed, but certainly has no soul. It may be safely affirmed that Christianity has no doctrine, no ordinance, no custom that does not need the new. Even such fundamental doctrines as that of the Trinity, and the person of our Redeemer may, negatively, be free from error as thus far apprehended, but that the positive apprehension of these facts is as full now as it will be in the end, who will undertake to say? And what are the doctrines and customs of the churches to-day but developments of the past? If they be legitimate developments, who has been authorized to say that that development should cease just here and now, and not go on in the future as it has in the past? Has the full stature of manhood been reached? If the voice of inspiration declares that no generation, past or to come, shall be

perfect before another, but all be made perfect together in the day of the Lord Jesus, what particular church has received a special order from heaven declaring, "Thou art my well-beloved Church, in whom I am perfectly well pleased. Let all the churches hear thee!"

But if, on the other hand, any man cut the chain that binds us to the past, let go the long end and fasten the short one in himself as a new starting point, he will sever himself and followers from the true life of humanity, and open the way to go off in a tangent to unknown regions of darkness and death. The case is all the same, whether the chain be broken by himself, or by his immediate fathers, or by their fathers, anywhere between himself and the Head, who is both the beginning and the ending. We must be true to the legitimate old of our fathers, as they were true to that of their fathers, back to the times of apostles and prophets. Just because churches have no regard for this principle is the reason why they fall into many hurtful ways. He only is a safe leader, and can strike out into new fields, whose mind is filled with a knowledge of the past, whose soul is inspired with its spirit, not only of his immediate ancestors, but of all ages. The history of the Church demonstrates that whilst it was prepared for every emergency and could adapt its power and grace to all circumstances, its life was continuous and unfolding all the way through. It could thrive and grow in secret and under oppression in the caves and catacombs of the first three centuries; it could take into its bosom the Roman empire, as in the next three, and sit in the high places of the earth; it could breast the spear and battle-axe of barbarians, as in mediæval times, and make them vigorous bearers of its grace; it could burst the external bands of authority when they stood in the way, as in the Reformation, and produce a form better suited to its day; and it can yet work up the various elements of strength and beauty as now found in different organizations into a perfect union in the Church of the future, in which all will have attained unto the unity of the faith and of the Son of God, wherein there will be

neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but all and in all *Christ*.

These will be the latter days of glory. Outward civil authority and inward spiritual grace will be one power; and the individual, because in perfect harmony therewith, will be truly free. The book of nature will be identical with the book of revelation. The spirit of love will pervade every heart; every mind will possess the key to all mysteries and to all knowledge. The race will enjoy the truth in its goodness and beauty in all relations, from the mineral up to the Creator, will be fully conscious of its high position in the universe—in a word, will be able to know the world, know itself, know its God—and all, because beginning as a babe and then becoming a man, it has all along been true to the great principles—the old and the new.

ART. III.—THE SACRAMENTAL THEORY OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

BY THE REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D.

THE Heidelberg Catechism devotes in all *eighteen* questions to the subject of the Holy Sacraments. The first *four* (Ques. 65–68) discuss the general nature of the Sacraments. Then the Catechism proceeds to particulars. It considers Holy Baptism in *six* Questions (69–74), the Holy Supper in *six* (75–80), and the necessary qualifications of communicants in *two* (81 and 82).

The fact that nearly *one seventh* of the entire Confession is occupied with this one subject indicates the importance which the authors of the work, as well as all sections of the Reformed Church of the sixteenth century, attached to the nature and observance of Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper. The prominence of the Sacraments becomes still more significant when

compared with the notable fact that the fundamental doctrine of modern Calvinism, namely, the eternal and immutable decree of election unto salvation and of reprobation unto damnation, which is central in the articles of the Synod of Dort and in the Confession of the Westminster Assembly, is nowhere named, much less formally considered and affirmed.

The sacramental theory of the Heidelberg Catechism, to be rightly apprehended, must be studied in its relation to the leading issues of the sixteenth century. The history of three hundred years, embracing as it does not only great civil and social convulsions, but the most profound revolutions in theology and philosophy, has brought new questions into prominence to which, in the nature of the case, the Catechism can have no direct reference. Examined from the stand-point of theological problems in the form in which they are now prevailing, and in the light of the present religious habit of thought and sentiment, its language must convey an uncertain and perverted sense—a sense that contravenes the faith and spirit of the Catechism. The primary law of exegesis here is the same as that which must govern a valid exposition of the New Testament.

Two opposite errors respecting the Lord's Supper confronted the Reformed Church: the one belonging to the sphere of faith, the other the sphere of unbelief,—the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and the Socinian doctrine of commemoration, with all the perversions and abuses that grew out of these antagonistic theories. Towards neither one did the Reformed faith occupy a purely negative attitude. A pure and thorough denial of the Roman conception of communion and of the Socinian conception of commemoration would, for the Reformed Church, have involved a serious violation of the objective truth. The pressing necessity of the time was not simply to deny on either side, but to affirm, to affirm the important truth underlying the Roman position, and the Socinian or rationalistic negation, and to affirm in such way as to hold the truth of both in union with an elimination of all their errors and perversions. Whether the solution of the difficult problem as reached in the Heidelberg Catechism was entirely successful, or whether the

solution can stand as satisfactory and final for all subsequent periods in Reformed Theology, we need not now affirm, nor need we inquire; for we are dealing with an historical, not with a critical, question. We have to do with the question: What is the sacramental theory of the Heidelberg Catechism? not with that other one: Is its sacramental conception a perfect formulation of the nature of the Sacraments?

That the bread and wine of the Holy Supper are by the act of consecration transmuted into the true body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; that Christ is continually offered by the priest on the altar in the unbloody sacrifice of the mass, that this unbloody sacrifice in and by itself confers a spiritual benefit upon the members of the Church apart from their personal fitness to communicate; that the virtue of the mass avails for the release of the dead who are enduring the horrors of purgatory; that the host is to be adored by the faithful, and the cup to be withheld from the laity;—these and other affiliated errors were denied and rejected. But the important truth which animates these errors was not denied. That the sacraments are in reality divinely instituted means of grace; that the divine-human Christ Himself is present in the Holy Supper, and with His crucified body and shed blood feeds and nourishes the believer unto everlasting life; that the saving virtue of the Sacrament is objective, or in the sacramental transaction itself, and does not depend on the personal character of the celebrant or communicant, however necessary faith may be to the appropriation and realization of the virtue of the Sacrament; that the personal benefit received by faith in the Holy Communion is not confined to the moment of participation, but extends through the subsequent history of the believer even unto the resurrection from the dead; these truths, taught under various modifications of form by the church in every age, were held firmly and affirmed with emphasis.

On the other side, however, there is also both error and truth. That the sacraments are merely symbolical representations of the redeeming work of Christ; that the observance of them by the Church is only a significant commemoration of historical

facts, tending to keep these facts fresh in the minds of men; and that the spiritual benefit derived from the Sacraments depends altogether on the faith, contemplation, devotion and godly living of the subject; these rationalistic errors were by necessary consequence also denied and rejected; but not denied and rejected summarily. As on the side of Roman error, so here, the truth of the symbolical view which rationalistic thinking falsifies, was not ignored, but sacredly maintained. That the sacraments are a symbolical transaction, not the original historical fact itself re-enacted and repeated by the Church; that the subject is and must be active in the proper observance of the sacraments; that the Holy Supper does exhibit and represent the sufferings and death of our Lord; and that faith, devotion and holy obedience are requisite in order that the grace of the sacraments may issue in complete salvation and glorification;—these are truths involved in the symbolical theory that demanded due recognition, no less than the idea of objective efficacy and communion, which characterizes the dogma of the Roman Church.

Relatively to the Roman Church the issue pertained chiefly to the Eucharist. As regards Baptism, there was indeed a doctrinal difference; but the difference was not essential, as it pertained not so much to the nature and necessity as to the administration of this Sacrament. Hagenbach classifies Baptism with the Trinity, the Person of Christ, the Atonement, and others, under the general head of "doctrines in which Protestants and Roman Catholics more or less agreed." He says: "Among the doctrines in which Roman Catholics and Protestants preserved a certain agreement, in opposition to the minor religious sects, was that concerning Baptism. For though the baptismal formula was different with Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists; though differences of opinion obtained respecting the efficacy of Baptism, as regards original sin; and the fate of those children who die unbaptized, and as to the capacity of faith in the baptized and the degree of grace conferred in the rite; yet Protestants and Catholics entertain essentially the same view of *the nature of Baptism*, asserting: 1. Its

general necessity, in opposition to the Quakers. 2. Its sacramental character, in opposition to the Socinians; and chiefly, 3. The necessity of infant baptism, in opposition to the Anabaptists. And lastly, the Roman Catholics, in accordance with their view of the baptism of heretics, were compelled to acknowledge the validity of Protestant Baptism, while on the other hand, the Protestants always regarded Roman Baptism as a Christian ordinance, and never thought of re-baptizing those who were converted to their own faith." In confirmation of this view, he quotes the following from the eminent Protestant Theologian, Marheineke: "Of all the Sacraments, that of Baptism is the one respecting which Roman Catholics could always unite most easily with the Protestants, and would have had the least reason for framing particular canons, in order to keep up any difference in respect to points of secondary importance;" and then adds: "The reformers also declare, that of all the Sacraments, that of Baptism was least corrupted, and that this ordinance had more than any other been preserved from the addition of heterogeneous elements."*

Relatively to the Socinians, Anabaptists, and all the fanatical sects of the period, the issue pertained to both Sacraments, inasmuch as this entire left wing of Protestantism occupied a purely negative attitude, denying the proper sacramental character of Baptism and the Eucharist, and thus resolving the Sacraments into external symbols and empty ceremonies. In opposition to all forms of fanaticism and rationalistic unbelief, the Reformers stood on the basis of the old Catholic idea respecting sacramental grace, and asserted both the necessity and the objective efficacy of Baptism and the Eucharist.

Confronted by these two forms of error, both of which were perversions of important truth, the Heidelberg Professors who were appointed to frame a mediational confession, felt that the epoch demanded and their commission required, that they formulate the old faith respecting the Sacraments as taught in the

---

* History of Doctrines, by Dr. K. R. Hagenbach, Professor of Theology in the University of Basle.—Vol. II. p. 364.

New Testament and held by the primitive church, so as to affirm the truth underlying both the Roman and the Socinian theories, and at the same time exclude the false principles and all the heterogeneous elements which these theories involved. On the one hand, they had to affirm the reality, necessity and efficacy of sacramental grace, and yet avoid the theory of transubstantiation, of *opus operatum* efficacy for the living and the dead, as well as all the doctrinal consequences flowing from the Roman dogma. On the other, they had to maintain the proper symbolical and commemorative character belonging to the sacramental transaction, and yet give no countenance to the negativeness and empty formalism of the entire left wing of the Reformation movement.

As regards the Lutheran dogma, the attitude of the Catechism was to be different. Occasioned by the transition of the Palatinate from the Lutheran to the Reformed Confession, and designed to be a mediation between opposing interests, or a union of the Calvinian and the Melancthonian theological tendencies, the antithesis to Lutheranism was subordinate to the main issues, and pertains to the most pronounced form of the Lutheran dogma, as subsequently developed in the Form of Concord.

Although the Reformed view of the Holy Supper is specifically different from that of the Lutheran, yet in their negative relation to the Roman and Socinian theories they are one, being but two modes of solving the same difficult problem, the one having less affinity for the theory of transubstantiation, the other less affinity for the symbolical view.

In the light of these historical relations must we study the sacramental theory of the Heidelberg Catechism, in order to unfold the proper import of its teaching, and determine the bearing of the Reformed doctrine upon the various forms of unbelief of the present day.

To develop the idea of the Catechism fully, it would be necessary to consider the eighteen questions which are devoted to the subject. As this would require more space and time than we have at command, we will confine ourselves to an exposition of the first four questions, which deal with the general nature

of the Sacraments. Of this general idea the conception of the Holy Supper is regulative rather than that of Holy Baptism.

Sixty-Fifth Question.

Since then we are made partakers of Christ, and all His benefits, by faith only, whence comes this faith?

The Holy Ghost works it in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel, and confirms it by the use of the Sacraments.

From the doctrine of justification by faith, the Catechism passes to the sacraments. Ques. 65 forms the transition from the one to the other, but is not designed to teach directly the nature of either one. It assumes what has already been taught concerning faith, and postulates what is hereafter to be unfolded concerning the sacraments. In the light of this transition and connection, the question and answer are to be interpreted.

We are justified not by works but alone by faith in Jesus Christ. Whence comes this faith? How is it begotten? And how strengthened and sustained?

The question distinguishes between *Christ* and the *benefits* of Christ. "Since then we are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits." Emphasising the distinction, it at the same time holds the two in their true relation, agreeably to a ruling principle of the Catechism. We are made partakers of Christ, and thereby of His benefits also. The first is primary and fundamental, and thus in order to the second. Not the reverse. We cannot partake of His benefits unless we partake of Himself.

Participation in Christ is by faith and by "faith only." Faith is emphatic not in opposition to the sacraments, as if faith itself were all sufficient, and the sacraments in consequence not essential, but in opposition to *works;* not to works however as the fruit of living faith, but to works as the ground of justification, or as a means of salvation. Good works are a part of the Christian life, and just as necessary in their place as faith (Ques. 86 and 87); but not in the sense of the Roman Church.

Whence comes this personal faith which we exercise in Christ, the faith by which we are righteous before God, the true faith that must issue in good works?

The Catechism does not inquire into the way and manner in which religious faith in general is awakened; how, for example, the heathen and the unbaptized in Christian countries are led to believe in Christ. But the question is specific. It inquires concerning *this* faith, or into the way in which the faith of the baptized members of the Church is generated, assuming that the Catechumen, agreeably to the whole tenor of the Catechism, and the immediate context, is a child of the Church, and not a child of the world. The question implies that whilst Baptism engrafts the subject into the Church and thus creates a spiritual capacity for saving faith, this engrafting is nevertheless by itself insufficient. It does not issue in salvation unless the subject improves the grace of Baptism by believing in Christ, which is a personal act of his own. He may or may not believe. He may be baptized, and yet not attain to actual deliverance from sin, according as he does or does not surrender himself in faith and obedience to Christ. It is now concerning this faith, specifically, that the Catechism inquires—Whence does it come?

"The Holy Ghost works it in our hearts by the preaching of the holy Gospel." The Catechism ascribes personal faith to the Holy Ghost; not directly to the Scriptures, not to preaching, nor to the sacraments; but to the Spirit. Spirit does not denote the Spirit of God who works in nature and providence, nor the Spirit as He wrought in the Jewish communion; but the Spirit of God in Christ, or more directly, the Spirit of Christ as Head of His Church, by whom the Father governs all things. (Ques. 50.) The gift of faith as well as all heavenly gifts, Christ our Head sheds forth in us His members by His Holy Spirit; the communication and abiding presence of His Spirit being the benefit which we receive from the glory of our Head sitting at the right hand of God (Ques. 51). Compare Ques. 53, where it is said that the Holy Ghost is given to make me by a true faith partaker of Christ and all His benefits. The Spirit proceeding from Christ so operates in us that faith in Him, as the true and only Saviour, is begotten.

But the Spirit of Christ does not operate abstractly or apart from suitable agencies; that is, agencies that answer on the one

side to the economy of grace, and on the other to the constitution of man. These are not the common events of Providence, such as health and sickness, war, famine, pestilence, and the like; neither science, literature, philosophy; nor the arts of civilization and social culture; for they all belong to the order of this world, and possess no fitness either to be the organ of the Spirit or to quicken the spiritual capacities of our fallen nature. Ignoring all these human resources, the Catechism knows of only one agency which is adapted to the quickening of faith in our hearts by the Spirit, and that is the preaching of the holy Gospel. The Spirit works faith not by the Gospel, but by the preaching of the Gospel. But the two are intimately connected. The idea of preaching depends on the idea of the Gospel.

What the Gospel is according to the Catechism we are taught in Ques. 19. The Gospel is not the written or spoken word, but a concrete economy of grace, symbolized in the old dispensation and fulfilled in the new, or foreshadowed in symbols, and realized in the incarnate Son of God—Heb. i. 1, 2. This supernatural revelation centering in the person and life of Jesus Christ, is the object of faith, and according to Ques. 22 is taught in sum in the articles of the Apostles' Creed.

Preaching is the proclamation and teaching of this objective truth by men, men living in Christ and called of God to be the ambassadors of Christ in the world. The objective truth and preaching, though distinct, are yet in one respect the same. The latter is the living utterance of the former, and is filled out with its mysterious and heavenly power. Truth and word, life and word, go together; neither one is real and actual without the other. The life without the word, or the objective mystery of revealed truth without utterance, does not complete itself. It does not get access to the consciousness of men. The word without the life, or the word not filled out with the living truth, is dead, an empty sound, a tinkling cymbal. Says St. Paul: "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life;" 2 Cor. iii. 6. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are are life;" John vi. 63.

Thus viewing preaching in its internal connection with the Gospel or the substantive truth, we see that it is not an instrument or an external mechanical agency, but the necessary medium or organ by which the Gospel apprehends and addresses man, a free and intelligent being. Whilst the Spirit alone is the author of faith, the preaching of the Gospel, being the organ of His quickening activity, is the necessary condition on which the effectual working of the Holy Ghost in our hearts depends.

The word *heart* is significant. The Catechism predicates faith, not of the understanding, not of the will, nor of feeling, but of Me. Faith is a life act; it is lodged in the center of our personal existence, and, active from within, pervades and controls all the powers of human life. This profound depth of our being the Spirit alone can penetrate, and no organ but that which He Himself creates and animates is adequate to His mysterious working. As the preaching of the Gospel apart from the sacraments is the only organ of the teaching of the Spirit, so it is also an *effectual* organ. Lively preaching never fails of its end. Men in general, as well as the baptized in particular, are so wrought upon supernaturally that they must believe in Christ, or wilfully reject Him. For the Gospel of Christ is the power of God. (Rom. i. 16.) A savor of life unto life, or of death unto death (2 Cor. ii. 16); and they who preach the Gospel are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish.

The personal faith in Christ which the Holy Ghost works in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel He also *confirms*. "He confirms it by the use of the holy sacraments." The confirming of faith is predicated of the Spirit. The Spirit works faith; and the Spirit confirms faith in our hearts.

The answer consists of two parallel clauses which predicate two forms of the internal working of the Spirit; and in each case His working is not unmediated, but mediated. He is active under both forms through corresponding agencies or means; the one being the Word, the other the Sacraments. As He quickens faith in us by means of the preaching of the Gospel, so does He also by means of the sacraments confirm the faith which He has

quickened; implying that He does not work faith by means of the sacraments, nor confirm it by means of the preaching of the Gospel. Interpreting the language in the sense of the Catechism, the phrase He *works* faith, expresses a form of the energy of the Spirit, which He puts forth through the Word; whilst the phrase, He *confirms* faith, expresses another form of the energy of the Spirit, which He puts forth through the sacraments, the one being originative, the other complemental and perfecting. The preaching of the Gospel and the use of the Holy Sacraments are thus two distinct means or organs, through which the Spirit carries forward in us, the members of Christ, the work of grace unto Eternal Salvation. Neither one can take the place of the other, but both are equally necessary.

The assertion that the Spirit confirms faith has a two-fold significance according to the two-fold relation which faith involves. Faith is related to its object, Christ, the only mediator, and to its subject, the believer himself. On the one side the relation may be expressed thus: Is Christ, God and Man in one, the true Saviour of sinners? Is His Sacrifice on the cross a complete propitiation for Sin? Has He overcome death indeed, and is He, who is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh, now glorified at the right hand of God? Does He make me a partaker of Himself in His death and resurrection? These glorious facts the Spirit teaches through the Word, and He confirms them through the Sacraments—the Sacraments being a living, perpetual witness of the Spirit to the objective truth. In this respect the energy of the Spirit in confirming faith through the use of the sacraments is objective.

The other side, the relation of faith to the subject, may be expressed thus: Do I turn away from myself, from all my own works, and put my trust alone in this all-sufficient Saviour? Do I appropriate Him with all His benefits? Am I living in Him, and growing in communion and fellowship with Him? Such surrender and repose of myself in Him the Spirit has awakened in me through the word, and now strengthens and develops by the sacraments; the sacraments being the means of grace through which the Spirit continually increases and per-

fects my personal trust in Christ, and nourishes my communion with Him, unto eternal life. In this respect the energy of the Spirit in confirming my faith through the sacraments is subjective.

The Spirit confirming my faith thus objectively and subjectively, not by the sacraments, but by the *use* (*gebrauch*) of the sacraments; implying that He does not operate through the sacraments as objects, external to myself, but through the observance of them. The sacraments are to be administered, and I must use them. Considered either as a doctrine or as the institution and ordinance of God, they are not the medium through which the Spirit confirms my faith. He confirms my faith in and through the actual transaction. The phraseology indicates the conception of the Reformed in distinction from that of the Roman Church, the conception which is definitely asserted in the subsequent questions and answers.

The plural form, holy *Sacraments*, is not to be construed rigidly. As before stated, this expression, like the entire answer, is to be interpreted in the light of its position and general purpose. It is intermediate between the doctrine of justification and the doctrine of the Sacraments. Supplementing the one, it is designed to prepare the way for and introduce the other. Were the answer not such a transition, and did the Catechism intend that this final form of expression should be construed rigidly, we would have the singular instead of the plural. Then the formula would be: and confirms it by the use of the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For there can be no room for doubt as to the class of Catechumens whom the Catechism contemplates. They are the baptized children of the Church.

The entire answer means to teach the two-fold work of the Spirit in regard to faith. As it does not teach what the Gospel is, but assumes what was before taught concerning its nature; so neither does it teach what the sacraments are, but, preparing the way for their consideration, it supposes the following question, which takes up and unfolds their nature and efficacy.

Sixty-Sixth Question.

What are the Sacraments?

The Sacraments are visible, holy signs and seals, appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof, He may the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel; namely: that He grants us out of free grace the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life, for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross.

Sacrament, from the Latin *Sacramentum*, is a Theological term that came into general use during the history of the middle ages, and is derived from the Latin Vulgate, where sacramentum occurs as the translation of *μυστήριον*. The word is not found in our English version, but in place of it we have *mystery*, the translators having simply Anglicised the original. The Reformers, adopting the term that was in general use, it thus passed over from the scholasticism of the Roman Church into Protestant Theology.

In the New Testament there is no common term applied to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the word mystery never occurring directly as a designation of either one. The writers always speak of both in direct and specific language. But we do not wish to intimate that New Testament usage does not fully warrant us in speaking of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as mysteries or sacraments.

The answer expresses the general conception of a Sacrament as held by the Reformed Church in the sixteenth century. The conception as here given is fundamental. It underlies and rules what the Catechism teaches respecting Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and draws a broad line of demarcation between the doctrine of the Protestant and that of the Roman Church.

In reply to the question—What are the Sacraments, the Catechism says: "The Sacraments are visible, holy signs and seals appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof He may the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel."

Sacraments are *signs and seals*. As signs, they signify and symbolize the grace of God and the presence of this grace.

The German is not *zeichen*, but *wahr-zeichen;* not simply arbitrary signs of an absent something with which they hold no internal connection, but *tokens* or *truth-signs;* for that which signifies is so closely related to the thing signified, that the former becomes the warrant or guaranty of the presence of the latter. On this point there was no division of sentiment among the Reformed Theologians of the sixteenth century. They are unanimous in denying the Socinian theory, that the Sacraments are *empty* signs, merely symbolizing grace that is not connected with the sacramental transaction.

As seals, the Sacraments realize the grace which they represent, or assure us that the grace which is signified is really present and active in the sacramental transaction. The full conception is expressed by sign *and* seal; not partly by sign and partly by seal, as if each one expressed a separate conception, but by sign and seal as denoting different aspects or forms of one idea.

The signs and seals are *visible*. Being outward and natural, they confront the senses, and they are holy; because appointed of God, they are set apart from a common and natural to a sacred and spiritual use. The natural is consecrated; and thus related by the Spirit to that which is supernatural and Divine; the conception of a Sacrament comprehending two things: the visible and the invisible, the natural and supernatural, the earthly and the heavenly. Either one separately conceived, the natural disconnected from the supernatural, or the supernatural disconnected from the natural, is not the Sacrament. It is the connection of these two factors by the appointment of God that constitutes the sign and seal.

The Reformers adopted the well-known saying of Augustine: "verbum accedit ad elementum, et sacramentum fit." The word comes to, or is joined to the natural element, and the sacrament comes to be. This word the Catechism expresses by *promise*. The word of God or the promise is not the sacrament, as little as the natural element, but the word in conjunction with the natural element.

In applying the term sign to the sacrament, the Catechism follows a theological usage that came into vogue since the time

of Augustine and Tertullian. But it is worthy of observation that the writers of the New Testament never use the word. Neither Baptism nor the Lord's Supper is anywhere called a sign. St. Paul speaks of circumcision as a sign,—"and he received the sign of circumcision;" Rom. iv. 11; but he nowhere speaks of Baptism as a sign. He, as well as all the other writers, refer in every case to Baptism in the use of some direct, concrete and specific term, that comprehends the factors of the sacrament in their unity.

But the conception of sign and seal does not exhaust the nature of sacraments. The scriptural idea includes the end for which they are appointed, or a relation to their purpose, that is, to the subjects in whom the Spirit operates through them. The end is two-fold: to declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel. By the use of the sacraments God *declares* the promise, and He *seals* the promise to us.

God declares the promise by a real, visible transaction in which we participate. The sacraments possess an element in common with the word. Through them God teaches us. The German is *uns zu verstehen gebe;* He gives us to understand. God sets before us the promise in a real transaction, so that we may the more readily apprehend its nature and fullness in relation to ourselves. He does not teach us by means of external symbols, but through a transaction wherein He and we are both active; He imparting, and we by faith receiving the grace which He imparts.

Hence the teaching activity involves the sealing activity of God. God seals to us the promise which He declares to us through the sacraments. The sacraments themselves do not seal, but God seals through the sacraments. To seal is not only to certify the promise to us, but also to make it truly ours, or to put us really in possession of the promise.

The word seal is to be taken in the Christian, not in the Jewish sense; in the sense of the New Testament, not in that of the Old. Judaism and Christianity differ in kind, not only in degree; the one being the type and the other the substance of salvation. Sacraments, in point of character and virtue, corres-

pond to the nature of the economy to which they belong. The Mosaic economy being preparatory and typical, Circumcision and the Passover are typical also. The Sacraments of Judaism cannot possess a character higher than Judaism. The Christian economy being not preparatory but final, not typical but substantive, Baptism and the Lord's Supper must correspond to the positive character of Christianity. Their essential nature is not the symbolical, but the true and substantial. They cannot possess a character lower, or less real and less positive, than the Christian economy does to which they belong.

The sacraments of the two economies are indeed analogous. Baptism and the Lord's Supper sustain the same relation to Christianity that Circumcision and the Passover sustain to Judaism; but for this reason Jewish Sacraments do not become the standard of Christian Sacraments. Rather the opposite. The Sacraments of Christianity enable us to understand the Sacraments of Judaism. The proper standard by which we are to judge of Christian Sacraments is Christianity itself in opposition to Judaism; just as the proper standard of Jewish Sacraments is Judaism in distinction from Christianity.

If therefore on the alleged authority of St. Paul, Rom. iv. 11, we adopt the term sign and seal which he applies to circumcision, we must give them a Christian meaning. As St. Paul draws a broad line of distinction between the law and the Gospel, setting the latter directly in opposition to the former; as he distinguishes with equal clearness between Baptism and Circumcision, nowhere calling Baptism a sign, but always affirming this sacrament to be a positive means of grace, the washing of regeneration and the washing away of sins; and as it is circumcision, the shadowy ceremony of a transient and superseded economy, that he calls a seal of the righteousness which Abraham had, being uncircumcised;—we must, in applying these terms to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in order to be consistent, fill them out with a sense answering to the positive substance of these Christian Sacraments as taught by St. Paul. The seal of circumcision was not in order to the faith of Abraham, but his faith was antecedent to the rite, which was added from without as an

external certification and acceptance of his faith. But as Baptism and the Lord's Supper differ as widely from Circumcision and the Passover as the Gospel differs from the Law, St. Paul, as well as the other writers of the New Testament, never apply the term seal in the Jewish sense to the Christian Sacraments.

Let us examine the term as used in the New Testament in its direct relation to the economy of grace. St. Paul says, evidently referring to Baptism: "In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." Eph. i. 13. Sealing is predicated of the Holy Spirit. The words *in whom* relate to Christ. The Ephesian believers were sealed in Christ with the Holy Spirit. Again he says: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of Redemption;" Eph. iv. 30. Here as before the sealing is by the Holy Spirit of God. The washing of regeneration was the sealing act of the Holy Ghost. The same use of the word occurs in his Epistles to the Corinthians: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts;" 2 Cor. i. 22. *Who* relates to God. Sealing is predicated not of man, not of any external symbol or human transaction, but immediately of God. God hath sealed us, says the Apostle. Predicated of God, sealing affirms a saving act of Divine Grace. In another place St. Paul calls the Corinthians the seal of his apostleship. "The seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord;" 1 Cor. ix. 2. The Corinthian Christians were the living product and authentication of his apostolic office; and in this sense the seal; for they were the positive realization of the grace which he proclaimed and dispensed. Our Saviour also uses the word in regard to Himself,—"For Him hath God the Father sealed;" John vi. 27. The reference is to His Baptism. God sealed His Son by the direct communication of the Holy Ghost, symbolizing the communication by the descent of the Dove.

In these and other passages the word seal expresses not an external ceremony, not something merely symbolical, but the veritable communication of the Holy Ghost, or a communication of the substance of grace by the Spirit. Sealing is the mysterious Divine transaction by which the subject, receiving the

Spirit, is lifted out of the natural order and put in direct communion with God.

Observe that conformably to the usage of St. Paul the Catechism predicates sealing efficacy, not of the sacraments separately considered, but of the Holy Ghost. As in Answer 65, it is the Holy Ghost that confirms our faith by the use of the holy Sacraments, so here it is God that seals to us the promise of the Gospel. The Sacraments are seals not as external certifications of Divine Grace otherwise bestowed, but because they are the medium of God's sealing efficacy, or the organs through which God Himself puts us in possession of the truth and virtue of the Gospel. This remarkable conformity of the Catechism to the usage of St. Paul and St. John in affirming sealing efficacy exclusively of God, we cannot overlook without perverting or mistaking the general conception of a Sacrament as given in the answer before us.

But the Reformed conception of the sacraments as thus presented, is not yet complete. There is another element on which special stress is laid. The sealing act of God involves a participation on the part of the subject. Seals are appointed of God, that *by the use thereof* He may declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel. A sacrament is not a mystery externally objective to us, constituted complete, and whole in our presence, and without our personal activity. It is not the water in the font. There is no baptism without a *washing* with water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Nor is it the consecrated bread and wine on the altar. There is no Lord's Supper without an *eating*, and *drinking* of the body and blood of Christ. A sacrament is a mystical transaction that includes not only the officiating minister of Christ and visible, natural elements with which are conjoined invisible supernatural grace, but more than this, it includes also the individual believer or believers, who receive the Grace that God dispenses. There are two parties to the transaction by Divine appointment, both of whom are essential. As there is no sacrament without the objective presence and saving virtue of Grace, so there is no sacrament without a subject receiving the

Grace. The mystery is a communion. Christ is active, and we are active. He communicates Himself with all His benefits, and we receive Him with all His benefits. This mystical *transaction* constitutes the sacrament.

The expression *by the use thereof* is therefore emphatic. It affirms what is peculiar to the Reformation conception of a sacrament, both Lutheran and Reformed, in opposition to the Roman theory, which, overlooking the subjective side, makes the sacrament, particularly the Holy Eucharist, an outward object, that, without a participating act of the people, is by itself the whole mystery, as such working its legitimate effect and challenging confidence, reverence and adoration. Breaking away from the onesidedness of the Roman theory, with all its consequent abuses, and returning to the explicit teaching of God's word, the Reformers recognizing the subjective as no less essential than the objective, assert positively the necessity of the participation and communion of believers, and thus reproduce the Scriptural idea in its wholeness.

The objective virtue of the sacramental transaction is different from that of the preached word. The Catechism says, "That by the use thereof, He may *the more fully* declare and seal to us." The German is: *desto besser:* literally, that He may *the better* declare and seal. The preaching of the Gospel, and the use of the sacraments are not equivalent means of Grace. God effects through the sacraments, not merely what He does through the word; not that only, and no more. These are not different forms of the same efficacious act of the Spirit; but He communicates Grace through the one as He does not through the other. They are different means. The difference lies in the clause "the more fully." These words, it is true, express a difference in degree, rather than a difference in kind; for the substance of Grace imparted by the Spirit, namely, Christ and all His benefits, is the same necessarily in both; but God communicates to us, by the use of the sacraments, that which without observing them we cannot receive.

The qualifying clause is to be construed both with *declare* and *seal*. By the use of the sacraments, He declares more

fully the truth which by the word He teaches. Contemplating the sacraments merely under the aspect of teaching, they possess superior efficacy to the word. But the force of the difference is expressed particularly by the word *seal;* for the sealing efficacy of the Spirit is wrought in us, not through preaching, but by the use of the sacraments, and by them exclusively. The Catechism thus makes the sacraments, as distinguished from the preaching of the Gospel, an *essential* means of Grace; means that do not stand on the same level, but through which a higher work than that of the Word, is accomplished in us by the power of the Spirit.

Thus far we have unavoidably been assuming the true import of the expression: *promise of the Gospel.* A superficial glance might lead us to think that "the promise" expresses something that is yet future, something not yet accomplished, but to be accomplished hereafter. This is the Jewish or Old Testament sense of the word. The promise fixed the eye of faith, not on a present possession, but on a future fact, and postulated a fulfillment in the ages to come. On a closer examination, however, we find that the Catechism uses the word in no such Jewish sense. The word is used here as in answer 22. It denotes the substance or truth of the Gospel, which was proclaimed by the Patriarchs and Prophets, and foreshadowed by the ceremonies of the Mosaic economy, but is now fulfilled by the incarnate Son of God, in whom the true and full salvation is really brought nigh, and freely conferred upon us; the sacraments being the appointed means by which the Spirit seals to us this full Salvation, accomplished in our blessed Redeemer. God seals to us, not a shadow, but a substantial reality; not a word, which He pledges Himself to fulfill, but the living Word, the Word fulfilled once for all in His Son.

Why, then, it may be asked, does the Catechism adopt a term that we are liable to misunderstand? The answer is found in its historical position, relative to the Roman Church. The phraseology expresses the unconditional certainty of the full Salvation of Christ, actually accomplished for us, a Salvation that

God freely confers by His Spirit, and we sinners receive through faith without any merit of our own; and stands opposed to the Roman notion, that a participation in the Salvation of Christ depends on what we are, or on the worthiness which we acquire by the performance of self-imposed works. Our personal Salvation, according to the Roman theory, is uncertain; for it always remains a matter of question and doubt whether our worthiness is of such kind and degree that the Salvation of Christ will eventually be bestowed upon us. In opposition to the notion that thus interposes the barrier of a human condition between the Salvation accomplished by Christ, and the communication of His Salvation to the sinner, the Catechism asserts the promise, or the undoubted word of God, that He out of free Grace grants us the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life.

That this is the meaning of promise is evident not only from Questions 21 and 22, as well as from the whole tenor of the Catechism, but particularly from the exposition of "the promise" as given in our answer: namely, that "He grants us out of free Grace the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life, for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the Cross." The general conception of a sacrament is complete as given in the first half of the answer. The latter part does not supply any additional attribute or element, as if the preceding formula were deficient, but stands in apposition to *the promise of the Gospel*, and derives its importance from this, that it develops and sets forth the nature of the promise or the meaning which the term conveys.

God grants us the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life; that is, the fullness of Christ under its negative and positive aspect. All that we need for our deliverance from sin, and all we need for the perfection of our being in Glory, God communicates by the use of the sacraments. God *grants*. He does not impute to us salvation, or merely in thought set salvation to our account, but He bestows it in reality. He *grants;* not, He *will* grant. God does not by the sacrament seal to us something that God will do, and for which we are to

hope, but what God imparts and we receive; or, to express the conception more accurately, the sealing act is the act in which God imparts to us forgiveness of sins and everlasting life.

This fullness of Christ God grants *out of free Grace.* Not any works of rightecusness which *we* may do, not any form of penance or mortification of the body, but the love of God in His Son, to us sinners, is the only source from whence His sealing activity proceeds.

He seals us "for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the Cross." Here as in many other places the one sacrifice is not emphatic in opposition to the incarnation or the resurrection of Christ, but emphatic in opposition to the Roman dogma of Penance, Intercession of Saints and the like, but more especially in opposition to the Roman dogma of the mass. The *one* sacrifice is antithetic to the repetition of it in the ceremonies of the Church; and the sacrifice accomplished *on the Cross* is antithetic to the sacrifice accomplished on the altar by the priest. We must interpret the Catechism from the stand-point of its own antitheses, and not from our stand-point, or in the light of new antitheses that prevail in the present century. The Catechism denies the necessity and virtue of the unbloody sacrifice of the mass; it denies the virtue of penances, indulgences, and all the works of man; and makes forgiveness of sins, or the sealing act of God by the sacraments, depend altogether and exclusively upon Christ and His work.

To sum up what the Catechism teaches concerning the sacraments as means of Grace, we may say that God, by the use of the sacraments, seals to us the promise of the Gospel, and to seal the promise is to grant us the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life.

Rightly considered, the answer is an explicit and comprehensive formula, maintaining the necessity and objective efficacy of the sacraments, and at the same time contradicting two opposite errors, the Roman dogma on the one hand, and the Socinian or rationalistic theory on the other. But in the attempt to escape the Roman notion of an *opus operatum* effi-

cacy, it encumbers itself with a difficulty which it evidently feels and labors to overcome, but which in some measure neutralizes the force of its positive affirmations. The difficulty arises in viewing the sacraments as signs. If signs, then they signify something different from themselves. In thought the sacraments are thus divided, the supernatural being sundered from the natural, whilst nevertheless the Catechism undoubtedly holds the two in mystical conjunction. There is thus a want of entire harmony in its affirmations which somewhat obscures the doctrine, and exposes it to misapprehension and misconstruction.

The sacraments of Christ, strictly speaking, are not signs. They do not signify grace; and the Catechism does not allow the conception of a sign to have determinative force; but lays stress chiefly on the conception of a seal. The seal takes up the sign and absorbs it in great measure into itself; and thus in effect the Catechism itself denies that the sacraments are properly signs. It pronounces them signs *and* seals; not signs purely, nor yet seals only; but the two terms are equally necessary parts of one formula, which is designed to express the symbolical or representative element in its subordinate relation to the supernatural reality, and objective efficacy of the sacraments.

Not the sacraments, but the natural elements are signs. Water is a sign, but not holy Baptism. Bread and wine are a sign, but not the Lord's Supper. The natural and symbolical are one element or factor; but the mystical presence of Christ in His fullness is also an essential element or factor. The conception of a sacrament comprehends both the sign and the thing signified, with equal necessity, as the Heidelberg Catechism and all other leading Reformed confessions affirm, with one voice over against all the spiritualistic forms of unbelief that prevailed during the sixteenth century.

Sixty-seventh Question.

Are both these, then, the Word and the Sacraments, designed to direct our faith to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross, as the only ground of our salvation?

Yes, truly; for the Holy Ghost teaches in the Gospel, and by the Holy Sacraments assures us, that our whole salvation stands in the one sacrifice of Christ made for us on the Cross.

The question does not imply, that the Word and the Sacraments are means of grace possessing the same kind of efficacy; not that both are didactic, the word teaching in language and thus addressing the ear, and the sacrament teaching by symbols, and thus addressing the eye. Just the contrary is implied. "Are both these, then, the Word and the Sacraments," evidently means that they are two, and as such different as to their constitution and position in the economy of Grace. But the question implies that being thus different in their constitution and purpose, this difference might give support to the assumption that there is a corresponding difference as to the ground and source of our personal salvation; that the Word makes known what Christ the mediator has done for us, whilst the sacraments show what is done for our Salvation by the Church, and what must be done by ourselves, that the benefits of Christ may be conferred upon us. Recognizing the prevalence of this error, and intending to guard against its baneful influence, the Catechism inquires whether the Word and the sacraments, although different in regard to their nature and efficacy, are nevertheless both designed to direct our faith only to one and the same ground of Salvation.

The Catechism answers, "Yes, truly." Both are designed to direct our faith exclusively to the sacrifice of Christ on the cross; in other words, the sacraments do not presuppose any other ground or way of salvation than that which God teaches in His Holy Word. What follows, explains the sense in which *Yes*, *truly*, is to be understood.

"For the Holy Ghost teaches in the Gospel, and by the holy sacraments assures us that our whole salvation stands in the one sacrifice of Christ, made for us on the Cross." The language is nearly the same as that employed in answer 65, and follows the same order. Here as there the subject is the Holy Ghost. His activity is set forth in two relations, or under two different forms. We have two predicates, *teaches*

and *assures*. The Spirit teaches in the Gospel. The Spirit assures by the Holy Sacraments. By the sacraments He confirms to us what in the Gospel He teaches. There is this difference, however, between the two answers. *There* He works faith in us by means of preaching, and confirms this faith by means of the sacraments. His activity is objective. He does not address our minds, giving us correct knowledge of the ground of Salvation, but He apprehends our personal being, so working in us that we become believers in Christ, and grow up into Him. But *here* we have the enlightening work of the Spirit. His activity is subjective. He does not apprehend our personal being, but addresses our understanding. He does not work faith in our hearts, but He communicates the knowledge of Christ, whom by the faith which He has wrought in us we possess. As there He works objectively, so here He works subjectively. He teaches in the Gospel and by the sacraments.

What does *the Gospel* mean? According to Question 19 the Gospel is the concrete economy of grace. But here it is to be taken as synonymous with *word* in the question. Gospel is intended to mean the written word, or the objective Revelation as taught by the Evangelists and Apostles in the Books of the New Testament, and in connection therewith the oral teaching and preaching of what is contained in the written word. Thus the Spirit in the Gospel enlightens our minds or imparts a knowledge of the truth respecting Christ and His work, as being the only ground of our salvation.

By the Sacraments the Spirit bears witness to the same fact; for through them He exhibits Christ, Christ theGod-man crucified for our sins, and now living glorified at the right hand of God as our only Mediator. The Spirit teaching and the Spirit assuring, both forms of His activity center on one object, which is the key-note of the answer, namely, that our whole salvation stands in the one sacrifice of Christ made for us on the cross. Salvation from beginning to end stands in the one sacrifice, which is itself adequate to all our wants as sinners, and needs not to be complemented, according to the

Roman theory, by the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass. This is the great and fundamental truth taught by the two-fold form of the enlightening activity of the Spirit.

We must bear in mind, however, that, as stated in our comments on the previous answer, the emphasis which the Catechism puts on the sacrifice of Christ is not antithetical to other essential parts of His redeeming work. The implied antithesis is the contrary Roman theory. According to the Catechism the sacrifice of Christ is internally related to His incarnation and life in the flesh, on the one side, and on the other to His Resurrection, Glorification and coming again to judge the quick and the dead. Thus necessarily related backward and forward, the sacrifice of Christ possesses central significance in the economy of Redemption.

Sixty-Eighth Question.

How many Sacraments has Christ appointed in the New Testament?

Two; Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper.

The question involves a silent reference to the multiplication of sacraments by the Church of Rome, without warrant or authority from our Lord Jesus Christ. "How many Sacraments has *Christ* appointed?" implies that the Church cannot institute a sacrament, but that it must be appointed by Christ Himself; and that the only warrant for such appointment is to be found in the word of God. How many Sacraments has Christ appointed in the *New Testament?* implies that the inspired record of the Evangelists and Apostles is the only ultimate standard of judgment. No Church rite is to be held as a sacrament unless it can be shown from the New Testament that Christ has instituted it.

In the light of this principle of judgment, the Catechism answers "two." Christ has instituted only *two* sacraments; not seven, as the Church of Rome alleges. These are Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper, and the remaining five, Penance, Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Marriage and Ordination are rejected, as being without authority in the word of God.

Nor are they supported by the practice of the early Church. Only in the course of time were these rites exalted to the position of a sacrament, but not without a great deal of wavering, contradiction and conflict.

Yet the ancient Church always distinguished between the *two* and the *five*, even whilst the latter were growing in importance and asserting their claim to the position of a sacrament. Baptism and the Eucharist constitute a class by themselves, possessing an essential dignity and value such as was not accorded to the others.

Though the Reformed Church rejects these five additions, yet, excepting Penance and Extreme Unction, it does not deny to them all sacramental force and character; Confirmation, Marriage and Ordination being retained and perpetuated as important and necessary church rites. They are mystical transactions. With the external form there is conjoined an internal spiritual meaning and force. Yet though possessing in this sense a sacramental character, they are nevertheless not *sacraments*, using the term properly as applied to Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper.

We have had occasion to say before that these have no common name in the New Testament. The only exception may be 1 Cor. iv. 1. "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and the stewards of the mysteries of God." *Mysteries* certainly includes Baptism and the Eucharist, but here the word evidently comprehends a much wider meaning than Ecclesiastical usage assigns to *sacrament*. The Reformed like the early Church uses the word in the narrow and specific sense to designate that peculiar character which Baptism and the Eucharist, to the exclusion of all other Christian institutions and rites, possess in the New Testament; whilst the Roman Church applies the name also to what may be called sacramental rites, thus exalting them to a position and investing them with a dignity which, according to the New Testament, they do not possess.

In the New Testament the title is always specific. Baptism is called *Baptism*, Math. xxvii. 19; Mark xvi. 16; Rom. vi.

4; Colossians ii. 12; Eph. iv. 5; 1 Peter iii. 21; *Washing of regeneration*, Titus iii. 5; *The washing away of sins*, Acts xxii. 16; Rev. i. 5; *washing*, Eph. v. 26; 1 Cor. vi. 2; Heb. x. 22; and *sealing*, 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13; Eph. iv. 30; conformably to universal usage the Catechism adopts the title *Holy Baptism*, Baptism being the term most commonly employed by the writers of the New Testament.

Relatively to the other Sacrament there is a similar difference of terminology. It is called Supper, Luke xxii. 20; the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi. 20; the communion of the Body and the communion of the Blood of Christ, 1 Cor. x. 16. In this passage it is also called Eucharist, or the cup of thanksgiving. According to the three Evangelists who record the institution of the Holy Communion, Matthew, Mark, Luke, our Lord took the cup and *gave thanks;* the original in each case being εὐχαριστήσας; whence we get the title in such general use, Holy Eucharist. These three names found in the New Testament are the most common forms of designation. The Catechism employs them all as occasion may require, but adopts Holy Supper as the specific title, according to St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 20.

The substance of what the Heidelberg Catechism teaches in regard to the Sacraments may be reduced to the following propositions:

1. Christ has instituted only two Sacraments in the economy of His Church, namely, Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper.

2. Holy Sacraments are means of grace appointed by Christ, and of perpetual obligation in the communion of the Church, wherewith He exhibits and seals to us Himself and all His benefits, that is, the forgiveness of sins and eternal life.

3. The Sacraments possess objective virtue, being what they are in themselves through the word of Christ; but they presuppose faith on the part of the worthy recipient. The faith of the recipient does not condition the nature and efficacy of the sacramental transaction, nor the validity of the administration, but it conditions the personal appropriation of the grace which the Holy Ghost confers through the medium of the

sacramental transaction. Whilst my faith can not constitute the sacrament a real medium of divine grace for myself, nor put into it any efficacy whatever, it must nevertheless receive and make my own the grace, which is in it by virtue of the institution of Christ.

4. A Sacrament is a *transaction* by which supernatural grace is communicated under the form of a natural element, two different things being connected together in the ordinance. The element does not itself inclose grace, either as purely natural and common or as consecrated; nor does the Spirit hold grace connected with the consecrated element as such; but grace, that is, Christ and all His benefits, are inseparably connected with and communicated in the sacramental transaction; the transaction implying not only grace in connection with the use of the element, but also the dispensing of the Sacrament by the minister and the observance of it by the recipient.

5. The connection of supernatural grace with the use of the natural element is fundamental and essential. As, on the one hand, the bare use of the natural element is not by itself a Sacrament, so neither, on the other, does it consist in any supposed communication of grace by the Spirit without the use of the natural element according to the command of Christ. But the communication of grace is by the word of Christ joined to the use of the natural element, and goes with it simultaneously, the connection of these two things, the spiritual with the outward transaction, being so necessary that to suppose the absence or non-reality of either one is to destroy the idea of a Sacrament.

6. The recipient becomes the subject of grace or is a partaker of Christ and all His benefits as certainly and really as he receives the Sacrament. The natural does not communicate the spiritual; but as the spiritual goes with the natural in the sacramental transaction as certainly as the transaction itself is done, the recipient is a partaker of both at the same time. He receives the supernatural grace conferred by Christ as really as he receives the natural element dispensed by the minister.

In other words, in the sacramental transaction, not a part only but the whole Sacrament is administered; and the recipient obtains not a seeming, nominal or formal benefit, but the true and proper or substantial benefit of the whole Sacrament.

7. A Sacrament is not efficacious *ex opere operato;* that is, a Sacrament administered according to the command of Christ does not as such accomplish its ultimate end without the responsive activity of the subject. The sacramental transaction is valid whatever may at the time be the state or character of the subject, but the grace which it exhibits and seals does not have true effect in his personal life if he is and continues without repentance and faith.

These propositions are designed to express the general doctrine of the Catechism in its bearing upon the theological issues that confront the Church at the present day.

Art. IV.—WHY ARE WE REFORMED?

BY REV. JOHN H. SYKES, A. M., MARTINSBURG, PA.

In this article we propose to answer,—or at least attempt to answer—the question, "Why are we Reformed?" or otherwise stated, What do we mean when we say "We are Reformed?" And this for the reason that we regard it as very important and even necessary that we members of the Reformed Church should be able to give an answer to any man that asketh us of the faith that is in us (see 1 Peter iii. 15.)

In the first place we remark that we are *Catholic*. Let not any one be alarmed at the mention of this word. We use the word in its own proper etymological sense. We hold firmly to what belongs to the whole Church as such. What belongs to the true and proper conception of the Church,—the Church not only of this age, but the Church of *the ages*,—we profess and hold fast. We are concerned therefore, *primarily*, not so much

with what belongs to *the times*, as with that which belongs to *the Eternities*.

Christianity is not of such a character that it is one thing to-day and another to-morrow, in the sense of *opposition* or *contradiction*. It is not one thing *here* and another thing *there*. Christianity—the Christianity of Christ and His Apostles—challenges our attention and our faith as not only a religion, but as the only true, perfect, and complete religion; not only as *a true religion*, which may stand alongside of, and receive an equal share of respect with other religions, but as the only absolutely true religion; alongside of which every other religion must pale and fade away, and finally vanish as "the baseless fabric of a vision." Christianity therefore could not take to itself and occupy a niche in the Pantheon among the religions of the nations, but was not to be contented until the Pantheon had cast out its gods and idols, and become transformed into a Christian temple.

Now if Christianity be the absolutely true and the only true religion, adapted to still and satisfy the deep wants and longings of the human heart; it is, and must ever remain in its essence and substance the same. Like its author, God, it has no variableness. Corresponding to man's own nature, which in revolving centuries remains in its fundamental characteristics unchanged, so Christianity which is adapted and corresponds thereto remains unchanged. If these things be so, then it follows that what is Christian at one time is Christian at another time, and at all times or always. So also what is Christian at one place is Christian at another place, and at all places, or everywhere. If we can grasp this thought, then can we begin to understand how it comes to pass that Christianity can not adapt itself to *the times*, the changing fashions, and changeable whims and notions of men; but *must* enter into conflict with these and wage an unceasing warfare until finally the kingdoms and the nations, with all that is in them and belongs to them, shall bow to the victorious sceptre of the once crucified, but now for ever exalted Saviour, Jesus Christ.

We often hear now-a-days disquisitions and discussions as to

the truth of certain matters; and sometimes the discussion is concerning "*the truth*," as it is called. This brings us now to the question, once scoffingly asked by Pilate, who having asked it, *would not stay* for a reply but turned on his heel, and walked away. His question was, "What is truth?" We once heard this question answered in this way. "Truth is conformity to God." "Whatever is in conformity to God, is true; as for instance, a man whose life and acts are in conformity with what God intended they should be, is a true man." This definition, when rightly understood, we regard as correct. Yet we may answer in a different way; we may say that "Truth is the full and complete correspondence of our conceptions or ideas, with the thing concerning which we think or speak." "Whenever our conception or idea concerning an object corresponds *in all respects*, with the object itself concerning which we think or speak, then our conception or idea is a *true* one." Our ideas concerning an object, however, may be partially true; true in some respects, and false in others. They cannot then be said to be true in the absolute sense. Our ideas of Christianity may be of this character; frequently *are*. Who, that has had any extended experience of the Christian life, does not know how much his ideas of that very Christian life have changed? Yet, who would for that reason say that the normal type of that Christian life has changed; is continually changing? Is not the normal type of the Christian life, as it exists in the mind of the Deity,—and as it is set before us in the New Testament Scriptures,—in its very nature unchangeable? Our understanding, comprehension of it may be changeable, may be continually changing—ought to be continually progressive, ever approaching the absolutely true; but the normal type thereof is itself unchanged and unchangeable.

Now see how our Heavenly Father has adapted the Gospel and its provisions to our nature in this respect also, in that whilst our apprehension of Divine things is changeable and progressive, while the normal type is unchangeable, He provides and establishes and maintains in His Church, through the ministry, the continual preaching and proclaiming of the ever-

lasting and unchangeable verities which He has set before us in His Word. So that as our ideas change, they may continually approach nearer and nearer to that which God sets before us as the absolutely true. And in order that we need not be in any doubt as to the Christian life itself, (the point to which we have adverted by way of illustration,) He has set before us as a perfect model and pattern thereof in the Person, Life and Work of Jesus Christ, the God-man, our ever blessed Saviour. Not in cold and bare doctrine, not in abstract philosophical speculation—which it would require a philosopher to reduce to practice, but "in His Life, the law" (i. e., the law of God, which is the law of love) "appears, drawn out in living characters."

Thus we come to notice that Christianity is not primarily *doctrine*, not *truth*, not *promise*, not *law;* but *life*. The great need of man since the *Fall*, that act of sin, which brought Death into the world, and all our woe, is LIFE, and "this life is in His Son." God's own Eternal Son, who when He undertook to deliver man did humble Himself to be born of a Virgin; did humble Himself even unto death, the shameful death of the cross; did descend as to His body into the cold and silent grave, hallowing it, and making it a sacred resting-place for all His saints; did descend as to His spirit into the Kingdom of the dead, there to announce the fulfilment of their hopes, "the fight is fought, the victory won; hell is vanquished, heaven is won!" He did rise triumphant from the dead, bursting the bonds of the grave which none e'er brake before; ascended to His Father's right hand, there to live, and rule, and reign, there for us to intercede, there by His ever-living life, to be the life of all who believe in Him, and so live; until He shall come again with power and great glory to judge the quick and the dead. And from His exalted position at His Father's right hand, He sent the Holy Spirit, as the first-fruits of His ascension, by whom and through whom, the Divine-Human Life of the Redeemer is communicated to them who shall be finally saved. He sent the Holy Spirit not only to communicate the Life of Christ to sinful men and so make them live in Christ Jesus;

but also to be the ever abiding Presence of God in the Church, the Blessed Comforter; the soul, so to speak, of Christ's mystical body which is the Church; and so ever abiding, living in, ruling and guiding the Church into all truth. Then as the result of this giving of the Holy Spirit, the Christian Church; the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of Sins; and the blessed assurance of the resurrection of the body, and the hope of a glorious immortality, where we shall reign with Him over all creatures. These facts, *i. e.*, these fully completed and accomplished acts, which God has done for man; *these* facts are the themes upon which the blessed Apostles loved to speak; and by their oral teaching of these facts, and by afterward writing these self-same facts and truths, they challenged the faith of men everywhere; and civilized and barbarian, bond and free, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, were confronted everywhere with this same Gospel or *Good News* concerning what God had done for man and man's salvation.

It was only when vast numbers of men in all corners of the world had been gathered in, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings; and when after conflicts fierce and long continued, with all the various forces and phases of the powers of darkness arrayed in serried column against the Lord and His Church; and when, after a conflict of three hundred years, carried on, on the one side with the aid of torch and sword, and stone and cross, the dungeon, the torture, confiscation of goods, exile, death in every cruel and bloody manner that the perverted and inverted ingenuity of man could invent, or the infernal hatred of Satan and all his imps could suggest; and carried on, on the other hand, by simply proclaiming the truth as it is in Jesus, by prayer to God, and humble submission to His divine and holy will; after a conflict of such a kind, carried on for three hundred years, it came to pass that Rome's imperial sceptre bowed itself before the wondrous cross of Christ; and the emperor himself, clad in his royal purple, appeared at the assemblies of the formerly despised and persecuted Christians, and delighted to call himself their friend and protector.

During this period of fire and smoke, the faith in Christ,

based upon the wondrous facts of the gospel, had been nourished and cherished in the hearts and minds of thousands of His followers, who counted not their lives dear unto them, so that they might win Christ, and have part among the inheritance of the saints in light. And when they were permitted to come out into the light of day, and in the presence of men, under the sanction of authority and law, make known the *faith of the church*, the results of the oral and written teachings of the apostles (of blessed memory!) that faith was found to have crystallized itself in that wondrous "form of sound words," which comes sounding down to us through the ages, which is known to us and to all men, by the short and simple, but expressive name, "The Apostles' Creed." This ancient symbol, hoary and venerable with age, expressing the faith of the apostles, and having its echo and response on every page of the Bible, and in every Christian heart, was the language in which the Catholic Church of the first centuries expressed *its* faith. Under this banner they rallied; under this standard they fought against any and every form of heresy and falsehood and perversion and distortion of the truth. There is no falsehood so false as a perverted or inverted truth; just as "there is no pang so strong as love to hatred turned," and hatred is only inverted love; and just as there is no solid so firm as a pyramid standing on its broad base, and tapering gradually and continually to the top; so also there is no solid whose position would be so precarious as that self-same pyramid inverted, or, in plain English, turned upside down, and balanced tremblingly on that which should be its apex.

Time would fail us to tell of all the errors and heresies which beset and continually harassed the Christian Church of the first three centuries; now denying to Him, that is, to Christ, a true human body, and making Him only possess a phantom body; (just as some now-a-days would resolve the Church of Christ, which is His mystical body, into a myth, a mist, or a phantom;) and then again, denying His true divinity, and consequent kingship; (just as some now-a-days would deny the divine or superhuman element in the Church, and the kingly

side of our Saviour's official character, and would resolve the Church into a humanitarian moral self-improvement society, or mutual admiration association, or, running to an extreme in another direction, would regard the Church as a barn or granary where ripe fruit is stored away for future use;) and then again, in their conceptions, and subsequent expressions, arbitrarily sundering the divine and human elements in Christ's person, and making out of Christ a monstrous kind of Siamese twins, joined outwardly by an exterior web of flesh; (just as some now-a-days would arbitrarily separate Christ and His Church, and make out that there is no such thing as Christ abiding permanently and continually in His Church by the Holy Spirit, as He Himself has promised, saying, "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world").

But against all these and many other heresies, the church of the first centuries had to oppose only the one weapon—the faith of the apostles, the "faith" once delivered to the saints. And so we to-day against heresies continually arising from the graves of the departed past centuries, like so many spooks and ghosts and phantoms, shadowy forms, and clad in grave-clothes (for are they not the unquiet and ever restless and unblessed spirits of long ago exploded, and therefore dead and buried errors?) against all such armies of hobgoblins we raise our labarum, and chant in unison with the noble army of martyrs:

I believe in God the Father, Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth;

And in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; He descended into Hades; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

Lord, we believe;

Help thou, O Lord, our unbelief!

This is our banner of victory, and in this sign we *shall conquer*. And so are we truly Catholic; for we hold fast to the faith of the Catholic Church, the Church of the first three centuries; we hold fast to that faith which overcame the might and force of the Roman Empire, and brought it into subjection to the cross of Christ.

As it was also in the development of the Church in the world so also it must be with every human soul who would finally be saved. Christ must be born in our hearts by the power of the Holy Ghost, live in us, as a purifying, vivifying, hallowing, ruling principle; and by living, real communion with His Church we must be brought to feel, as the Apostles, and those associated with them felt, the power for our faith of those facts of the Gospel, whereby the Lord has revealed Himself to us, and made us acquainted with the wonderful length and breadth and height of redeeming love; and has made us understand the powers of the world to come, the solemn realities of that eternal world whither He has gone to prepare mansions of blessedness for those that love Him, crowns of glory that fade not away, and palms of victory for them that look for His appearing, and who looking steadfastly at Him who is invisible to mortal eye are so enabled to fight the good fight of faith, and so to overcome the opposing hosts of darkness, whatever form they assume. . . Then shall we be able to know the doctrine that He teaches, even as we are known; then shall we learn to know the truth *as it is in Jesus*, and our conceptions of it shall correspond to the objective reality itself; then shall we also hear with willing ears, and be able to treasure up in good and honest hearts those exceeding great and precious promises which He speaks to them that love Him, and then will our faith agree with the faith of the blood-washed throng who have gone before us in the way of salvation, and now surround us as a cloud of witnesses looking down upon us from the heavenly world.

Now holding fast to these facts of the Gospel which are so beautifully set before us, in order, in the Apostles' Creed, which is for us therefore, "a form of sound words wherein we

have been instructed,"—this is what we mean when we say that we are truly Catholic.—And when we say that we of the Reformed Church are truly Catholic in this sense, we only express what is pre-eminently true of all the true members of the said Reformed Church, and has always been true concerning them. For is not this same "form of sound words," *viz.*, the Apostles' Creed deeply embedded, enshrined, embalmed, incorporated as one of the chief and prominent parts of our Heidelberg Catechism, that only authoritative exposition of what we hold and teach?

And is not that same Heidelberg Catechism dear and precious to every true son of the Reformed Church? Always and everywhere we hold fast to this symbol. In every corner of the Reformed Church it is known and honored, and is coming every day into higher repute among us, endearing itself to our hearts and the hearts of our children, and winning for itself outside of our own communion still new conquests.

But while we are thus, as we say, truly Catholic in *this sense*, in the true and proper, the old and original sense of the term we are also at the same time, not *Roman* Catholic; but we are in the *second place*, also *truly Protestant.*

If we trace the history of the Christian Church in the world, we find that that which was the Catholic Church of the first three centuries,—and was known and honored throughout the world as such, by its contact with the world, by its intimate and close union with the state, by its gathering in, (by crowds and multitudes,) the inhabitants of the Old Roman Empire, and by permitting these unregenerate elements to be received into itself and become a living and integral part of itself, without proper and necessary assimilation; by this imbibing of the spirit of the world in various forms and ways, it became transformed from the Catholic Church of the first centuries into the Roman Catholic Church of after ages. The element which is specifically and properly called Roman, carrying with it the old Roman spirit of skill in managing and governing, ruling and swaying, and bringing into subjection hostile material, doing this by the power of force and cunning diplomacy; but the

spirit at the same time of rapacity and domineering cruelty, the spirit of deception, superstition, idolatry and sensuous display; this spirit so plainly to be seen manifested in the successive development of the Roman Empire, which made it indeed a *power* to be *feared;* but a power to be hated as much as it was feared;—this old Roman spirit entered as an element into the Catholic Church, which when wedded to this spirit, was no longer the Catholic Church of ages past, but the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. Yet while this spirit, having been permitted to enter the holy abode of the Church, by its direful words tarnished the hitherto fair fame of the Church, and soiled by its dark deeds the spotless robes of that virgin Church, yet still not in such sense as to utterly destroy its Heaven-descended life; for is not that life in its own nature indestructible? So that, amid abounding worldliness, there were still green spots of genuine purity and godliness visible.

The Roman Catholic Church of the centuries intervening between the age of Constantine and the age of Leo the Tenth, with its imposing hierarchy, its magnificent pageantry and outward splendor, its strong unity and powerful organization, was an instrument in the hands of God to discipline the barbaric nations, and lay strong and deep the foundations for our modern Christian civilization. While conceding what is true, therefore, gladly and cheerfully, and so avoiding the false conclusion, which is incomprehensible and not to be believed, which yet nevertheless many minds have contrived to gulp and swallow down, somewhat after the manner of a huge bolus, (we know not how,) *viz.*, that the Christian Church was suffered to become and to be for twelve centuries totally extinct; or else, as others think, it had existence only in the little eddies, and pools of the sects, whose various wonderful and fantastic names, even, astonish us, not to mention their still more various, wonderful and fantastic tenets; some of which sects are hardly known, and can with difficulty be distinguished the one from the other; we cannot for a moment conceive on the one hand that the ever living, ever glorious and exalted Lord forgot, for twelve hundred years His last parting promise to the Apostles, "Lo, I am

with you alway even unto the end of the world;" nor on the other hand, can we believe that during all this time the powerful organization of the Roman Catholic Church was totally deserted by Him, and that during all this time He dwelt in those little eddies and pools, staying in one until it dried up, of sheer dryness and lifelessness; and then hopped into another, just opening out upon the shore of the great current.

But then also truth compels us to say that one of the great distinguishing features of this period (which we have defined above) is this: That it loses sight of the life of Christ, which is the soul of the Church; and concerns itself chiefly with outward ceremonies; that it busies itself with many things, all of which tend to produce an imposing show of outward unity, and outward uniformity; but this outward uniformity, so brought about, is, at the best, but a *uniformity of grave-stones*, showing the spot where the good and the great lie buried, buried deep. And first and last, at the beginning and at the end of every inscription, in deeply inwrought and prominent capitals, that stare you in the face at every turn, the magic word ROME, the name of the mighty sculptor, appears.

So that during this period, the ever-living Christ is hidden and concealed among a huge multitude of saints, saints of every hue and shape; so that the eager soul which wishes to get a glimpse of Him "who is the fairest among ten thousand and the altogether lovely," cannot get at Him "for the press," but must rest satisfied or *unsatisfied* with the forlorn hope that some one of the countless host of saints may possibly take pity on a poor mortal, and in this second-hand way, the petition may possibly finally reach Him. In this period, one gets to see indeed, sometimes, the Saviour Christ, but it is only in the form of a helpless babe in the arms of a huge overshadowing Madonna, who shines in magnificent regal robes, as "queen of heaven." Nay even worse than this, the Saviour of the world oft-times lies buried and so concealed beneath a huge mass of bones and garments, and finger nails and hair and staves which are said to have belonged to men long since dead.

Against this forcible—though pretendedly pious—smothering of Christ, we *protest*, and hence we are truly *Protestant*.

That mighty upheaval of the sixteenth century known as the Protestant Reformation, was not primarily concerned with doctrines; but was the wailing cry of the nations after Christ; the nations coming to the grave where Christ had been buried, crying like Mary "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." Then having found the Resurrected Lord, the free and joyous disciples proclaimed with trumpet tongue, the facts of our common Christianity.

Then after the conflicts with the powers of darkness, now wearing ecclesiastical garments, that they might work their dark and malignant designs the better; (we say after this conflict), there followed the regular arrangement of doctrines into systematic confessions of faith.—In these confessions of faith we have another attempt to set before the mind of man, through the eye of his understanding, the doctrines of the gospel.

These confessions of faith and catechisms of the Reformation period, when compared with the earliest forms of similar documents, will be found to be not identical in form and phraseology with those earliest expressions of Christian consciousness. Each age seeks to find in, and lead forth from the inexhaustible mines of wealth contained in the one unchangeable Gospel, that which is peculiarly adapted to meet and satisfy its own wants. So that we find, in tracing the history of the Christian Church, that in different periods, different sides and applications of the same truth are presented with a peculiar force and propriety. And it is a striking characteristic of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as a production of the Divine mind, that no one age can exhaust its fullness, no nor all the ages together combined. Just here, however, also do we discover a correspond-danger to which the human mind is prone, viz., having found that some particular side or phase of divine truth is peculiarly adapted to the wants of some particular period or state of society, man is apt to concentrate all his mind and attention upon this one side, to the neglect of all the rest; and so his conception of the Gospel, and of Gospel truth, becomes *one-sided;* and just to that extent and degree lop-sided, or incor-

rect and untrue. While it is still true, on the other hand, that the Gospel is not one-sided, but many-sided; or perhaps we should say all sided, having a manifoldness and fullness which the mind of man will never fully grasp.

We need not wonder then that the confessions of faith and catechisms of the Reformation age, are not identical in outward form and structure with the corresponding documents of an earlier age. And further, we would say, if some new stage of the development of the Christian Church in the world should at any time arise, calling forth, and so justifying some new expression of the faith of the Church, we would not look for a reissue of any of the old or older forms but something different from all, and yet agreeing with all the preceding ones.

We may illustrate what we mean by an examination of the books of the Old or of the New Testament. The Revelation which God gave of Himself to man in the Garden of Paradise, the Gospel which there was spoken, was not identical in outward form and structure with the Revelation which He gave of Himself on Sinai, or that which He gave through Isaiah or Elisha. The church in the wilderness, had (as to outward form and structure) a different revelation of God from that which the Church, with the temple service at Jerusalem, under the peaceful and prosperous reign of the wise and mighty Solomon, had. The word which sounds through Jeremiah seems in this respect quite different from that which sounds through Malachi. And so also, who will say that the Gospel according to Mark, is identical in form and structure with the Gospel by John? And who also does not discover quite a difference in representation and delineation between the Epistles which come first in the order of time, and those which come last?

And yet we know that it is the same "holy gospel which God Himself revealed, first in Paradise; and afterwards published by the Patriarchs and Prophets, and was pleased to represent it by the shadows of sacrifices and the other ceremonies of the law; and lastly has accomplished it by His only-begotten Son." (Heid. Cat. Q. 19.) And it is the same Gospel which He has made known to men through the Apostles and men of God chosen and set apart by Him for this very purpose.

Or we may represent the case by the analogy of a person approaching from a distance a building (a house or monument); from a distance he receives an impression of the outlines of the structure, dimly defined perhaps, yet true and correct so far as it goes. He approaches nearer, and from this nearer position, he looks again; he receives another impression; some of the features before unobserved, now flash upon him; yet the outline before noticed, is still true and correct, only now more filled out. And with every progressive step, made towards the object, the peculiar features of the structure become more and more clear, until face to face, the traveler sees, in all its grandeur and beauty, the building itself. Now he sees in it what he saw not at first; but the outlines as first seen, and continually noticed at every point, are still the same. That outline impression has been true all the time and is true still.

So is it in regard to confessions of faith which are, in any proper sense, true and correct. Though providing for the peculiar wants of the particular age in which they are produced, they must yet, to be true, embody that which was true in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, true concerning the firm foundations of our most holy faith.

In conformity with this thought, we find also that the confessions of faith and catechisms of the Reformation period do not discard the past, and throw behind them as so much rubbish, what previous ages had produced; but they embody the Apostles' Creed in their *very heart*. What is true of the Reformed Church in this respect is substantially true of all the Reformation Churches. And we know that the Reformed Church has placed the Apostles' Creed, that which expresses the *faith of the ages*, alongside of, and co-ordinate with the Ten Commandments, which tell *to all ages* what God's justice and holiness demand from that man who would be righteous; and alongside of and co-ordinate with the Lord's Prayer, that prayer which teaches the men *of all ages* how to pray, and so approach aright to the mercy-seat.

But lest we tarry too long upon this point, we pass now to our third point, and remark that we are *Reformed*.

We do not believe that God had entirely forgotten nor forsaken His Church during the long period of twelve hundred years; but on the contrary we believe that when the Roman Catholic Church had accomplished in the world the work which *He* had given it to do; and in doing this work, had become worldly, carnal, corrupt, like the world with which it had had so much to do,—God put it into the hearts of devout and holy men to *reform* it or else *re*-form it; that is to say, to improve it by purification, or if by the obstinacy and wickedness of men, (spiritual wickedness in high places,) this could not be done, then to form anew, out of the old material increased by the addition of new elements, a Reformed Church.

Thus it can be easily seen, we claim to be a true living branch of the Church of the ages; a branch of later growth indeed, than some of the rest, but nevertheless partaking really and truly of the sap and life of the tree. We claim to have true, real, unbroken connection through the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, with the Apostolic Church, the trunk; and so with Christ, who is the ever living root. We are a branch of the Reformation Churches, not a miserable sect sprung from the over-heated brain, or insubordinate heart of some miserable sectary. We did not spring up from the ground in a night, like a mushroom; nor did we fall from the clouds in a tempest, like a meteoric stone.

So also we are *Reformed*, not *Lutheran;* we do not derive our church from any one man, nor pin our faith to any man's coat-tail; nor accept any one man as our Master; we hear the Lord saying to us still, "One is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." Yet we honor and revere Martin Luther, as one of the instruments whereby God worked a mighty change, for the Lands and the Nations. "Only this, and nothing more." Yet our Church stands side by side with the Lutheran, as over against the opposing hosts of darkness; as they also stood shoulder to shoulder in the days of the Reformation.

So again we are *Reformed*, not *Presbyterian;* we do not make everything to hinge upon the form of our church government,

nor take our name therefrom; nor do we hold to the eternal decrees of God in such a sense as to leave nothing, nothing at all for man. Though we too believe in the boundless sovereignty of God, in a true and proper sense, and are presbyterial in our form of government.

Again we are *Reformed*, not *Methodist*. We do not hold to a *method* however good and excellent it may be regarded, in such sense as to make it the Shibboleth of our little tribe, though it be said to be the work of great, good, pious and devoted men; we have a *better method*, the method which God brought into the world; the plan of God's Divine Grace. Though we too hold that there is a wondrous power in system and arrangement; and that our labors should not be hap hazard, chance strokes in the dark; but systematic and orderly in all things, avoiding confusion, and disorderly proceedings of every kind.

Again we are *Reformed*, not *Baptist*, as though everything hinged on the outward form of the Administration, even of Baptism; and as if the work of God in the human soul were to be measured by Liquid Measure; so many gallons or hogsheads being a sufficient and proper medium through which alone Christ would and could act, in receiving and acknowledging one as His own; while a less *quantity* would invalidate the force thereof, and prevent Christ from acting. Yet we believe in Baptism, (the Lord's Supper also,) and in the true and right observance thereof. And morever, if the thing were inquired into, it might even appear that we make more account of Baptism than even the Baptists themselves.

So again we are *Reformed*, not *Evangelical*. Though we too hold to the true *evangel*, the *good news*, the gospel, as firmly as any one.

We are *Reformed*, not *Episcopal;* we believe in the equality of the ministry; every one of our ministers is a shepherd and bishop of souls, subordinate (in this point of view) only to Him, who is the Great Shepherd and Bishop, even Jesus Christ.

And so also of other denominations which we need not here specify. So occupying our position, in the midst of the storm howling around us, and the wild confusion of the elements

surging beneath us,—we stand fast, our feet on a rock ; we can afford to say

"Lass brausse drauss die rauhe Welt!"

We have now defined our position as being *Catholic*, *Protestant*, *Reformed*, and so, as we firmly hold and firmly believe, also truly Christian. We stand aloof from all other denominations in a certain sense, and yet we hold common ground with each and all. We hold our denominational position in no sectarian or bigoted or narrow spirit. We honor and respect as much as any one can or should the denominational position of others. We believe there is room, in our day, and in our land, for all truly Christian denominations to work the work of the Master to the utmost extent of their knowledge and ability. We however lament and deplore the existing denominational divisions. There were no such divisions in the beginning. They were brought in by the follies or wickednesses or weaknesses of men ; and God who doeth all things well, overrules them for good ; just as He maketh even the wrath of man to praise Him, and the remainder of the wrath doth He restrain. But we also look forward with joy and strong hope to the Church of the future, in which all these denominational lines and distinctions shall be finally and forever obliterated and extinguished. When the Church, in the spirit of the Apostle John, the last survivor of the apostles, shall forgive and forget all past strifes, and the saints shall walk and live "in the light" and in the "love of God." Then shall be fully fulfilled and realized even upon the earth, that wondrous word of the Apostle, "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body and one spirit." (Eph. iv. 4, 5.)

Until then we must stand fast at our post, and defend what we believe to be right, until the Churches, not only our own Church, but the Churches reach that higher and more advanced position which we have mentioned above, and so will be able to see things in a clearer light than that in which we now see them, and so unite together, and realize in a deeper and better sense, than was ever yet realized upon earth, the idea of "one Holy Catholic Church," "agreeing in true faith."

Meantime our position is a peculiar one, and may be likened

to a stick standing perfectly upright; and so exposed to the danger of falling, if it fall at all, in any one of many different directions. Now it is plain if a stick be standing not perfectly perpendicular, but inclined,—say for instance to the north,—if that stick fall at all, it will not fall to the south, for instance, or to the east, or to the west, but will fall to the north, whither it already leans. So if it lean to the south, when it falls, it will fall to the south. But if a stick be perfectly upright, if then it fall, it may fall in any one of many different directions, and no one can tell which way it will fall unless it is known beforehand from what direction comes the power that influences it. If this be known, then one can predict with tolerable certainty which way it will fall.

But the upright perpendicular stick, while it is thus exposed to dangers peculiarly its own, does nevertheless occupy a position which is at the same time also the strongest, if only it is properly grounded. For while that which leans this way or that is already likely to fall (this way or that according to its leaning,) the upright stick, perfectly balanced on every side stands secure.

Even such is our position; let us stand fast therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and let us not be entangled by any yoke of bondage. AMEN.

Art. V.—FAITH A NORMAL ACTIVITY OF THE SOUL.

By Prof. Geo. N. Abbott, Mercersburg, Pa.

Every faculty of the soul has in view some special object or sphere either in the realm of nature or in that of spirit. The true definition of any faculty consists more especially in the assignment, of the object or sphere to which it is correlated. In other words, each particular faculty is an organ through which a specific effect is either actively or passively to be realized. Again the proper sphere of an assumed faculty or function should not interfere with the proper sphere of another, unless the functions are related as genus and species. The eye sees, and the ear hears; so the fantasy has its æsthetic world, and the understanding its pure thought realm. In this view it will be seen that the clearness with which the sphere of action or passion of any supposed mental faculty or function can be defined must give proportionate distinctness and significance to the faculty or function itself.

It will be the object of this brief essay to show that the function or mode of activity of the soul called Faith has a well defined sphere in the normal psychological economy, and also as a consequence that the fruits of the proper exercise of this function are no mere beatifying fictions, but are the genuine and reliable realities they purport to be.

By this announcement it is not meant to be intimated that faith as a proper function of the human soul can always and by all persons be rightly exercised at will, or that all the results conceived to be those of even a conscientious exercise of this power are strictly truthful. It may be that the soul is in an abnormal condition, such as to thwart an attempt or even to annul a disposition to put in operation this faculty; or on the other hand a false activity may grow out of this abnormal condition. But should any one be disposed to deny the existence

of this debilitating abnormal state of the soul, he might perhaps still be convinced that a want of universality of activity, or an apparent lack of universal truthfulness in action, does not necessarily invalidate either the existence or the strict reliableness of the faculty under consideration. It is generally believed that no science has a firmer foundation in the human mind or a better claim to confidence in its developments than mathematics. Its realm is not limited to the world we inhabit; but it legislates for all the rolling orbs which the eye and the telescope reveal. Yet what egregious astronomical falsehoods were cherished for ages out of a professed regard for mathematical harmony and propriety. Epicycle was heaped upon epicycle until at last the whole scheme of planetary movements became involved in inextricable confusion for the sake of holding to the *simplicity* of the circle as the base idea of the planetary orbits.

Again how apparently unequal is the capacity of different persons especially for the more abstruse portions of mathematical science! The differential and integral calculus finds few professed appreciators even among the higher order of scholars: for the most it would seem to be a branch of science which ought to have had its origin on some other planet. Yet the science of mathematics as a whole is confessedly one for which a capacity exists in the universal human intellect, and of the truth of whose deliberate conclusions no shadow of doubt is to be entertained.

Now the disabilities and the fallacies which may have been ascribed to the Faith-faculty by the spiritually indolent or insufficiently experienced no more furnish a criterion of the faculty itself than do the false theories of the Ptolemaic system or the incapacity of the vague-minded student give a measure of the true power of geometry and the calculus.

To proceed then, to the discussion of the topic in hand—the necessary antecedent to spiritual faith in man is a consciousness of personal need—a poverty of spirit. This consciousness takes its rise at the very heart of our personality, just where the personal *I* would assert itself, but cannot because something essential to the *I* is wanting. The conception in this respect is beyond the reality.

In the consciousness of Deity we may suppose that the assertion *I am* is an analytic proposition; that is one in which the predicate *am* in its full unrestricted import grows out of the very nature of the subject *I*. All that belongs to this *I* in conception belongs to it in reality. But this is strictly true of no other being: hence *I am* is the proper name of Deity, that is the name that contradistinguishes Him from all other persons.

On the other hand the most natural utterance of man's awakened self-consciousness is, I ought to be what I am not, nay cannot be of myself. The sense of need when fully developed is imperative in its demand for the discovery and appropriation of that in which the soul's proper reality consists. Now as hunger in the animal nature prompts to the apprehension of the appropriate food, so the rational soul's sense of its own inherent need forms the antecedent condition of its apprehension of the needed object. The whole process in the latter case is a more rational one than in the former, but the two processes of apprehension resemble each other in having their beginning in a negation—in the feeling that something is wanting in the subject.

In order to come at the idea of the reality needed by the human soul, let us resume the formulary utterance of perfect and independent personality, namely, *I am*. This brief formula is in one sense complete in itself, but yet admits of a fuller form. The sentence has now a subjective form, the meaning of the predicate being wholly dependent upon the subject; but the predicate may be more distinctly objectivated by the addition of a complementary word designating the contents of the word *am*. The word may by itself be understood to signify the highest reality; but the highest reality of personal being may be characterized by a specific term. As the New Testament, in general complements the Old, so in this particular instance the Great Teacher of the New Testament, furnishes the complementary epithet to the Mosaic name of Jehovah. The Old Testament teaches us that there is but one *I am:* Christ teaches that there is but one that is *good*. If we append the latter term to the Mosaic appellation we shall have in an ex-

plicit or distinctly objective form the sublime formula of personal perfection, namely, *I am good.**

Now this is just what man can not say of himself; yet his conscience when awake is ever forcing him to the solemn acknowledgment, "I ought to be good." The good, therefore, is that which man must personally realize and somehow make his own, in order to realize his proper manhood. The first step towards this realization is, as we have already seen, to feel the need of it. The poor in spirit are indeed incipient possessors of the spiritual riches; and they that hunger and thirst after righteousness are the ones that are to be filled. Here naturally arises the question with regard to the relation of positive revelation to the process in question. Can positive revelation of itself make tangible to the human soul the good that it ought to make its own? If so why are the distinct utterances of revelation of so little real import to the soul until it has passed through an experience of profound—nay almost desperate consciousness of its utter want of what it ought to possess? And why is it that so often in the midst of such experience those utterances come suddenly to have an entirely new and very wonderful significance? Yet though it be granted that positive revelation becomes operative only through a deep consciousness of spiritual poverty, it is not necessary to be inferred from this admission that such revelation has nothing to do with the origination of the state of mind referred to. The positive electric charge first produces by induction a negative state in a near body, and then when this negative state has reached a sufficient tension, the illuminating spark passes over: so may it be that while we, groping in thick darkness and deep sorrow, are feeling after God if haply we may find Him, the very fact that He is not far from every one of us may be the very occasion of the intensity of the darkness we experience. But however near the object of the soul's search, yet mere proximity or mere presentation, whether outward or inward, does not bring that object within our grasp. The spiritual must be spiritually discerned; and

---

* Compare Matt. xx. 15, last clause.

spiritual discernment cannot proceed in advance of spiritual growth and self-realization. In other words spiritual apprehension is one with spiritual nutrition: hence it is entirely natural that as nutrition is the end, so poverty of spirit or a hungering and thirsting for the good should be the beginning of the process.

At the same time the hunger of the spirit is not so simple a sensation as physical hunger appears to be in the common consciousness. It has in it a relational element something like that of the mathematician's negative quantity. There is an intrinsic propriety in the common illustration of a negative quantity by a debt, something owed to another—a negation implying an affirmation. So too the negations of personal consciousness are no mere indifferent vacua, but signs of indebtedness or duty, putting us in a broad relation both to ourselves and to the moral universe. They indicate what we ought—are under obligation to realize. *I ought* has then a deep significance; in it lies all the higher possibility of my being. The more clearly it is developed in consciousness, the more effective is it likely to be in the way of moving to action. At its acme of intensity it becomes *I must*, the counterpart to which is *I will*, that mighty affirmative in which both subject and object pass from conceptions into realities, and at the same time pass into each other.

While then the Divine self-affirmation may be conceived as an analytic product of the Divine consciousness, the human self-affirmation must be synthetic: it reaches out and lays hold of a reality out of self, corresponding to a lack of reality within self. If man can not in the higher moral sense say *I am*, he can even from the depths of his own nothingness struggle forth the utterance, *Thou art*, and art mine; and in this struggling utterance may find himself in the glorious presence, nay in the joyous participation of the longed-for reality.

Now this synthetic affirmation in which the good is realized to the moral self, and the moral self is realized to its own consciousness in the apprehension of its proper complement, is Faith. Hence we may define Faith as the method of apprehending the good.

In this view we may say by way of classifying, that the Faith faculty, as one has called it, is related to the idea of the good, as the fantasy is related to the idea of the beautiful, and as the understanding is related to that of the true.

The fantasy is the mind's active or working power in the developing and actualizing of the beautiful, as a living idea in the soul. The understanding is the corresponding working agency in the evolution and elaboration of the true as a substantial entity for the mind. So faith is the effective energy through which the good is apprehended and realized in and for the individual soul.

The first two named faculties have an apparent advantage over the third in the use of the senses. The eye beholds the beautiful bow in the cloud, the beautiful landscape, and the beautifully star-bespangled heavens: the ear drinks in the sweet melodies of nature and of song; and so a large amount of material is furnished for the imagination to work upon. Again the eye and ear gather up data from the sense-world for the understanding to consider; experiments can be made to test the truth of theories; constructions and measurements may prove the correctness of computations; and all sensuous impressions may serve to furnish suggestions to some form or phase of truth.

But the good, on the contrary, is properly an object of pure spiritual apprehension. It has no visual image for our outward senses. It has, to be sure, its *intelligible* image in the person of the One who "spake as never man spake;" yet to the simple eye of sense we can not suppose Him distinguishable from other men. If the overflowing goodness of his Divine nature irradiated His countenance, this was for the eye of faith to discern. Such apparent irradiation to his special friends would be but the halo of beauty which love always throws around its peculiar object; while yet the material lineaments are just as perfect in a thousand other countenances that pass unnoticed.

Still we are to remember that all beauty as well as all truth exist for the mind; the merely animal eye, though ever so keen, does not take them in. Besides it has been suggested in phi-

losophy that there may possibly be other means than any form of sense for the apprehension of all real objects—that the mind may in a higher state grasp them immediately by virtue of their intelligible essence, thus taking at once an interior view of them, and accomplishing at a glance what our present method of science struggles to accomplish by a tedious labyrinthine process. But whether or not such an ability to take inward views of all objects belongs to finite minds at any stage of their progress, it is certain that *some* objects can be measurably apprehended by a different method from that by ordinary sense, even in our present state; and no matter if the process involve difficulties and struggles, the ability at any cost elevates us immeasurably in the scale of being; it allies our feeble powers with the heavenly style of intelligence.

As our outer senses which constitute the extreme outer pole of our rational being furnish one avenue of communication with the real without us, so there may be, and is, at the extreme inner pole another sensorium or capacity for affection, which may in its peculiar way furnish data through which reality may be brought to light. Nor will it appear strange if beginning at this extreme inner point we find the characteristics of our method of knowing altogether the reverse of what they are in the case of knowledge elaborated from external data. The data, or sensations if we may so call them, may be negative instead of positive, a sense of want or need amounting in its utmost distinctness to a felt necessity, taking the place of a plenary impression of reality.* And finally, as the impressions

---

* In the opinion of the writer psychology ought to classify the passivities or affections of the soul which furnish the ground data of human knowledge into *positive* and *negative* affections. The senses of sight, hearing etc. and the intellectual intuitions of mathematical, ethical and other relations would fall into the class of positive affections; while hunger, thirst, and the like, with the moral longings or cravings would fall into the negative class.

It is a mistake to suppose that the so called five senses furnish *all* the data for a knowledge of the external world. A well loaded table may, to be sure, furnish many interesting subjects for the theoretical chemist; but a hungry man will find meaning in the articles of food, of which only the sense of hunger can give the initiative intimation. What cares the animal to know of the fruit ever so tempting in appearance, if it does not correspond to his individual wants—if it is not his food? The

of sense force upon us the conclusion that something exists, our agency being passive, so the higher order of data, namely the negative, may require an exertion on our part of positive volition or will. In fact the knowing process which takes place distinctively in and for the personal nature cannot be otherwise than voluntary; for the will is pre-eminently the person—the essential *I* of the higher consciousness—the self par-excellence. The will then is that which must be waked into full life and activity, if we would have a proper personal existence at all: and no wonder if in that act of faith which apprehends the supremely good, the very bread of life for personal existence, the will, that is the personality itself, must be called into action.

To repeat the same thought in other words, faith, being the act of appropriating the highest good as the nutriment of personal life, must come under the general law of such appropriation, which requires that the life-power assert itself as such, that is, show itself to be a life-power in the very act of converting foreign substance into nutriment, in, as it were, *enacting*, the strange into the familiar, the not-self into self.

---

mere sensation of taste whether of animal or man is no sufficient criterion of even the flavor of food unless backed by appetite.

It is to be observed that the positive affections are such with reference to the objective. They assert the reality of objects. The negative affections, on the other hand, negate the reality of the subject in some respect, and only indirectly imply the corresponding object. But the latter affections are indices of a more vital relation between subject and object than the former. We may often open our eyes on the surrounding world with a feeling of indifference; but we cannot feel thirsty with indifference. The implied object of the negative affection is much nearer in interest than the object of the positive sensation. The synthesis, too, of subject and object is more directly intimated in the negative, for on that synthesis the very life of the subject may depend. It may be added that the object being through the negative affection brought nearer the heart of the subject or ego has also by the same means its own heart or essential nature more directly laid open. I as subject can have no more profound knowledge of an object than when I know what that object is *for me*. Hence it may be inferred that the utilitarian theory of knowledge has a phase of truth, its error in practice being that it takes too narrow views of the rational needs of the subject, and consequently fails in its comparative estimate of objective worth.

There is danger even in religion of inadequate notions of the wants of the subject as such, and of carrying over the same inadequacy to our concept of the object. For instance we run a risk of making too little of the divine-human person of Christ when we make of that person only a means of our redemption back to God from an abnormal state of sin—important as that view of Christ truly is. There may perhaps be a more universal need of such a *living way* of approach to the absolute Divine.

The food that we eat cannot force itself into the circulatory system: much less can it vitalize itself into living tissues; and as this law holds good in the higher as well as in the lower realms of life, so neither can there be true knowledge in that region of being where knowing and living are one and the same without a putting forth of energetic action on the part of the knowing subject.

Now to put the thought we have been endeavoring to express into a brief and definite form:—The will must assert the being of God as the soul's highest good, and in this very act does the will first truly assert itself as a rational will; in this act is genuine manhood born.

God is in His person a purely rational Will, a purely active Intelligence; and in this will of His does He assert the existence of all things that are. In the exercise of a voluntary faith in God, then do we begin to reciprocate His act of creating us in His own image, and so begin to live in real earnest.

In passing into the mental region of faith then we come into a sphere of active knowledge. We are no longer in the realm of compulsory reasoning. The glorious realities of this region cannot be forced upon us. They must be willingly apprehended if apprehended at all. To think of knowing them contrary to our wishes would be like expecting to have a pleasure forced upon us. Our enjoyments are really such only in proportion as we bid them welcome; and not only is true faith a source of joy, but it has this element in its very essence. It has in it too the highest, purest kind of joy. It is, as the apostle tells us, the "substance [or ground-work] of things hoped for;" all the pleasures of rational anticipation are faith's. It is the beginning of a life in God, with a prospect, nay with a foretaste of joys unending, "He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent Me *hath* everlasting life."

The view thus taken of faith as a fountain of knowledge would lead us to assume for the knowledge originating in this source certain characteristics in part, though not wholly peculiar to this kind of knowing. It would seem that the character of originality must attach in a peculiar degree to what we know

by faith because of the extremely personal nature of its experience. The faith-process constitutes in fact the birth process of the genuine rational individuality. In it and by it the proper person begins to breathe the air of freedom. He is emancipated from the prison of sense, he is liberated from that state in which things take the lead of thoughts. In the realm to which he is elevated thoughts become things; space is filled with thought beauties, not mere dreams and phantasms, but realities compared with which the rock itself is a phantasm. But in a world where all the things are dependent upon thoughts, there must be genuine thoughts or there will be no genuine things.

Of course it is not essential to the originality of knowledge that the same truth be previously unknown. Vital connection with the individual mind is what gives to knowledge its true originality. Live thought is always original. The plant-growth of this season is just as instinct with the original life-principle as the growth of the last season, or, for that matter, as the first plant-growth on the face of the earth. There may be a lineal connection between these extremes; but still the poet of to-day may find in the rose of to-day all the fresh beauty that Anacreon praised in his day, or Eve in hers. So faith has had its lineal connection from Abraham, the father of the faithful, to the present hour; yet its "I believe" has welled up from each believing heart with as much freshness and newness of life as mark the very dawn of consciousness.

Another quality of the kind of knowledge under discussion, a quality growing out of the one just mentioned, is that of its being in a certain sense incommunicable. The objects of faith cannot with their true import be brought into the understanding except through the will of the recipient. Hence the difficulty of demonstrating the doctrines of religion to the unwilling or even the indifferent. The philosophers, whose principal aim is to give to the results of their reasonings such a logical form as will command for them universal assent, have found a difficulty in regard to the knowledge of the Divine character. Some of them plainly affirm that this knowledge is not by the ordinary methods transferable. Plato's assertions on this point

have indeed been attributed to a regard to personal safety and to motives of personal vanity; but while very probably something is to be allowed to those motives, yet it seems more likely that his assertions with respect to the difficulty of attaining to a knowledge of the Divine nature and the impracticability of divulging it to common minds had their principal ground in the honest convictions of that very serious-minded philosopher that the highest truth is personally experimental in its origin and consequently esoteric in its very nature.

Some more modern philosophers seem to have been stumbled altogether at the indemonstrableness of the articles of faith by the pure methods of the understanding and hence have allowed themselves to fall into the abyss of utter disbelief. Kant, taking a sort of middle ground, though inclined to the better side, chooses to call a belief in Divine realities a moral certainty (for the believer) rather than a knowledge; because he limits the term knowledge to the narrow boundaries of what is communicable without any loss of force. The certainty of even the *existence* of a Divine Being he makes to be dependent on belief, but a belief so thoroughly grounded in our moral nature as to insure that nothing can make it wavering when once established; "since"—to use his own words—"in that case my moral-ground-ideas themselves would be subverted, which I can not renounce without becoming worthy of contempt in my own eyes." Still this moral certainty is good in his view only for the individual believer; which he well expresses in the words:—"Since it rests on subjective grounds (of the moral sentiment), therefore must I not at all say, *it is* morally certain that there is a God and a future life, but, *I am* morally certain, *etc*"*.

But we should not fail to notice some important exceptions to the general incommunicableness of the knowledge by faith; and in a certain sense the exceptions cover more ground than

* The first-personal character of belief Kant seems to have well conceived. If he fails anywhere it would appear to be in making his belief too much a matter of inference from preponderant reasons, as intimated in the term *moral* certainty, instead of grasping with the warmth and tenacity of life the verities of faith. His classification seems better than his apprehension.

the rule. The truest form of expression of faith after all is that of communion with its object. In this form full utterance can be given to it. The language of it in its incipiency is: "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief." An overwhelming sense of personal weakness and necessity causes the soul to ejaculate a call for help, and in so doing it can not but make a direct address to the personal source of help. Some one has said that "an I without a thou is impossible." "It is not good that man should be alone," is a truth not limited to the so-called social nature, but extending to the depths of the spiritual being. Man without God, in other words, is not true man; he can not independently assert his humanity. The sole substantial ground of this assertion lies in the personal Divine.

But there is a special significance in the form of expression, "an *I* without a *thou* is impossible." The person required as the complement of self is not a third person but a second, in the very power of whose presence the first must discover the verity of its own being. Such a relationship of persons of course supposes intimacy of communication: hence between two persons united as man is to God by faith there is free and familiar communion, and on the part of man free scope for the most intimate expression of all the joys and blessed hopes founded upon a "faith that works by love."

Besides the direct communion with God involved in faith, or as a part of that communion, there will be a sympathetic communion with all the faithful. All truth must from the nature of the case be the common property of the whole circle of its genuine votaries. Within such a circle transfer from mind to mind is easy compared with a similar transfer to the uninitiated. In the latter case there must be as it were a building up of a capacity from the foundation before the mind can receive with readiness and with proper comprehension any recondite result of higher insight. The man who holds himself aloof, therefore, from the practical first principles of the Christian faith must not expect to realize the profound import of the "communion of saints." It is only by the regular experimental course and not by climbing up some other way that he can think to get up

to those high themes, mutual discourse and sympathy upon which so much edify the properly initiated.

The principal endeavor of this brief statement of the subject has been thus far, as set forth at the outset, to show that religious faith is in its nature not something foreign to man as such, although it be the gift of God; that, in other words, human nature is not merely capable of receiving faith as a graft or scion from another species, but in the exercise of a living faith is but realizing the highest truth and significance of its own species. The new life of faith is, to be sure, in a very important sense the product of the "ingrafted word," but at the same time in such a sense that the new is of the same bone and flesh as the potentialities of the old. The man who exercises religious faith is indeed the true and very man and nothing more.

But a genuine religious faith is no other than Christian faith: hence our sketch of the subject even in the light of mental science might hardly be regarded as an adequate outline without a more distinct allusion to the relation which spiritual faith sustains to the person of Christ. The time at present at our command however will allow of scarcely more than a suggestion on this most vital relation; but even so much may serve to show that so important a point was not forgotten in the conception of the theme.

And here as in every rational view of humanity the God-man is the all in all. Whether the theme be regarded in its objective or subjective aspect; whether we consider the truth to be believed or the capacity for apprehending it, the whole is involved in this personal prototype as well as antitype—this Alpha and Omega of rational existence. Christ in His historic life presents in perfect and absolute completeness both the process and the contents of faith as above attempted to be set forth. Beginning as a child, emptied as it were of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, by a course of faith and obedience growing into the favor of God and man, He at length attained to that conscious fullness of the Godhead which forms the transcendent synthesis of the human and Di-

vine towards which our faith looks with earnest aspiration—nay with lively hope; though of course the actual attainment shall always be to the high standard aimed at as the finite to the infinite.

The whole sum and substance of the life of faith can then be stated in another form as *Christ formed in us.*

But may we not look at the humility of the incarnation as in some sense involving simply a temporary modification of that primordial perfection of the Divine Sonship in which the first-born of every creature and he through whom every thing was made that was made were one and the same—the Omega, the absolute ending, being but a return to the Alpha, the absolute beginning? If so no wonder that Abraham learned directly from the preexistent Word the lesson of faith so well as to be honored as a father in the Christian family.

But by whatever line of thought we trace the subject, the true conclusion will be the same: the living content and substance of the matter is to be found in "Jesus, the beginner and finisher of our faith."

Art. VI.—THE INSCRIPTIONS OF THE CATACOMBS.

BY JAMES L. FERRIERE, A. M., PHILADELPHIA.

In the inscriptions of the Catacombs of Rome, the Christians of the early days of the Church have left a record of that era of trial and persecution, that has much of the freshness of personal narration clinging inseparably to it. These inscriptions, and the paintings and carvings that accompany them, express the feelings, and narrate the story of the lives of those early soldiers of Christ, whose leaders alone are known to us through written history. The church fathers live in their writings, and the names of some few among the early heroes of our faith have come down through the echoing ages, with the lustre and halo of tradition wrapt in golden clouds of glory around their honored names. But the rank and file of that "noble army of martyrs," and that host of humble believers, whose hymns of praise were the first strains of the anthems, that have ever since been swelling in fuller and grander chorus, and which will continue to swell, until they merge into the hallelujahs and hosannas of a "new heaven and a new earth," *they* are only represented by the simple records that mark their last resting places. In the dark and narrow passages of the Catacombs the genius of primitive Christianity still lingers, and in the inscriptions upon its tombs are to be found some of the best illustrations of that genius—"sermons in stones," addressing themselves to the heart and to the feelings, that are the expression of the purest portion of that early "Catholic and Apostolic" Church, to which all Christendom of to-day turns with affectionate reverence.

The epitaphs of the Catacombs clearly show, that by far the larger number of the early believers in Rome belonged to the humble, poor and illiterate classes of the community. Few of these epitaphs show any trace, either of the artistic skill of execution, or of the grace of diction that characterize the mortuary inscriptions of Pagan origin, that have come down to us

from that time. At the entrance to the Museum of the Vatican is a gallery some 450 feet in length, known as the Lapidarian gallery. Its walls are completely covered with inscriptions plastered into them to the number of upwards of four thousand. On the right hand are arranged Roman inscriptions of Pagan origin—Epitaphs, votive tablets, dedications of altars, edicts and records; on the left are the epitaphs and other inscriptions of the early Christians, that have been gathered from their tombs in the Catacombs. Standing in this gallery we have before us the social gulf that separated the two religions. On the Pagan side is all the pride and pomp of the world, the lofty titles of Roman citizenship, and the funeral lamentations over Rome's mightiest and noblest, all neatly and artistically engraved on the marble, and often expressed in hexameters that will bear the strictest scrutiny. How marked is the contrast that the inscriptions on the Christian side of the gallery present—carvings of the rudest and roughest description, straggling and incoherent sentences, betraying ignorance and haste in their execution, letters, irregular in size, mis-shapen and distorted, orthography that pretends to no system, and language that sets all rules of grammar at defiance. The first glance is sufficient to show, that "not many mighty, not many noble," were numbered among those whom these Christian inscriptions commemorate. In many the orthography is so bad that their purpose is almost defeated, and to do anything like justice to the manner in which they are carved they should be represented in fac simile. The following as a specimen of latinity is probably unrivalled.

IIBER QVI VIXI QVAI QVO
PARE IVA ANOIVE I ANORV
M PLVI MINVI. XXX. I PACE.*

But there is also another contrast—a contrast of far deeper significance, that comes out in the picture of Christianity and Paganism presented by these inscriptions. The Pagan dead seem to

* Maitland and other authorities give as the probable intended reading of this inscription. Liber qui vixit cum compare sua annum I. Annorum plus minus xxx in pace. In all the inscriptions which I quote in this article I have endeavored to reproduce the exact orthography and punctuation of the originals.

sink into their graves without hope, and from them to cast back long lingering looks upon the pleasures of the life they leave. The mourner has nothing to comfort him, the dead nothing to hope for—

Omnes eodem cogimur; omnium
Versatur urna serius ocius
Sors exitura, et nos in æturnum
Exilum impositura cumbæ.*

Even the glorious dreams of Plato, soaring up to the very verge of truth, seem to have shed no ray upon those, who in Imperial Rome mourned for their loved ones lost in death. Listen to the heart-broken wail of a mother, sorrowing like one that has no hope.

C. IVLIVS. MAXIMVS
ANN. II. M. V.
ATROX. O. FORTVNA. TRVCI. QVAE. FVNERE. GAVDES.
QVID. MIHI. TAM. SVBITO. MAXIMVS. ERIPITVR
QVI. MODO. IVCVNDVS. GREMIO. SVPERESSE. SOLEBAT.
HIC. LAPIS. IN. TVMVLO. NVNC. IACET. ECCE. MATER.

Caius Julius Maximus (aged) 2 years 5 months. O relentless fate, who delightest in funeral rites, why is Maximus so suddenly torn from me? He who lately used to lie happily on (my) bosom. This stone now marks his tomb. Behold his mother.

A gloomy stoicism, the resignation of despair, or careless recklessness, are the highest sentiments these Pagan epitaphs exhibit. The dead turns from life with an epicurean regret that it can be no longer enjoyed, and from his tomb comes a heartless, chilling voice, idly enumerating life's pleasures, and cynically warning the survivor that he too must soon relinquish them:—

D. M.
TI. CLAVDI. SECVNDI
HIC. SECVM. HABET. OMNIA
BALNEA. VINVM. VENVS
CORRVMPVNT. CORPORA.
NOSTRA. SED. VITAM FACIVNT.
B. V. V.

To the Divine Manes of Titus Claudius Secundus. Here he had everything—Baths, wine and love. They ruin our bodies, but they make life (what it is). Farewell. Farewell.

* Horat. Carm. II. 3.

Augustus on his death-bed, turned to his friends with the question: "Have I played my part well? Then applaud me." And in the same spirit is the following epitaph:—

VIXI. DVM. VIXI. BENE, IAM. MEA.
PERACTA. MOX. VESTRA. AGETVR.
FABVLA. VALETE. ET. PLAVDITE.

While I lived I lived well. My farce is already acted out. Soon yours will be. Farewell and applaud (me.)

But even the humblest and most illiterate of the Christian epitaphs, breathing all the fervor of a new and certain hope, never speak of death but as a sleep—a sinking into a quiet slumber—a quiet rest, with a happy and glorious awakening.

DORMITIO ELPIDIS
VICTORINA DORMIT
GEMELLA DORMIT IN PACE
ZOTICVS HIC AD DORMIENDVM.
FLORENTI IN PACE.

Brief as most of them are, they ever look forward to a life beyond life, and in them we can see how immediate was the elevating influence of the new faith. The following homely record of a husband's sorrow cannot fail to touch the reader, and in it, side by side with the expression of a heart-breaking grief, a faith in the resurrection is clearly expressed;—

PAX.
HIC MIHI SEMPER DOLOR ERIT IN AEVO
ET TVVM BENERABILEM BVLTVM LICEAT VIDERE SO—ORE
CONIVNX ALBANAQVE MIHI SEMPER CASTA PVDICA
RELICTVM ME TVO GREMIO QVEROR
QVOD MIHI SANCTVM TE DEDERAT DIVINITVS AVTOR
RELICTIS TVIS IACES IN PACE SOPORE
MERITA RESVRGIS. TEMPORALIS TIBI DATA REQVETIO
QVE VIXIT ANNIS XLV MENV. DIES XIII
DEPOSITA IN PACE FECIT PLACVS. MARITOS.

In Peace—This grief will ever weigh upon me. May it be permitted to see in sleep thy revered countenance. My wife, Albana. Always chaste and modest. I grieve deprived of thy support, for the divine creator gave thee to me, as a sacred (gift.) Thou well-deserving one having left thy (family) lie in peace—in sleep. Thou shalt arise. A temporary rest is granted to thee. She lived 45 years, 5 months and 13 days. Buried in peace. Placus, her husband, made this.

The inscription, just quoted, is one of the few now extant that are of any length, and it expresses more of the human grief of the survivor than is usually found in these epitaphs. It will be in place in this connection to quote the following famous epitaph, which presents a vivid picture of those days of persecution. The inscription is probably of later date than the death of him whom it commemorates, and though it has generally been regarded as marking the grave of a martyr, still it would seem to hint that private hatred had something to do with his death. The event it records belongs to the fifth persecution in A. D. 161, under the second Antonine. It is also in better style than most of these inscriptions.

ALEXANDER MORTVVS NON EST SED VIVIT
SVPER ASTRA ET CORPVS IN HOC TVMVLO
QVIESCIT VITAM EXPLEVIT SVB ANTONINO
IMP. QVIVBI MVLTVM BENE FITII ANTEVENIRE
PRAEVIDERET PRO GRATIA ODIVM REDDIDIT
GENVA ENIM FLECTENS VERO DEO SA-
CRIFICATVRVS AD SVPPLICIA DVCITVRO
TEMPORA INFAVSTA QVIBVS INTER SA-
CRA ET VOTA NE IN CAVERNIS QVIDEM
SALVARI POSSIMVS QVID MISERIVS
VITA SED QVID MISERIVS IN MORTE
CVM AB AMICIS ET PARENTIBVS SE-
PELIRI NEQVEANT TANDVM IN COELO
CORVSCANT PARVM VIXIT QVI VIXIT
IV. X. TEM.

Alexander is not dead but lives beyond the stars and his body rests in this tomb. He closed his life under the Emperor Antonine, who foreseeing how many benefits would result from it, returned hatred for kindness. For, while on bent knees about to worship the true God, he was led away to execution. O sad times in which sacred rites and prayers, even in caverns, afford no protection to us. What can be more wretched than such a death, when they could not be buried by their friends and kindred. At length they sparkle in heaven. He has scarcely lived who has lived (in Christian times.)

The two opening words of this inscription, (Alexander Mortuus) leading us to expect a lamentation, and being followed by the positive assurance of immortality—the vivid description of the insecurity in which the early believers lived, driving them to worship in caves and secret places—the difficulty of

obtaining the bodies of the martyrs for burial, and the assurance of their heavenly reward, all contribute to render this a most interesting and valuable record of the lives of the early believers in Rome. And thus it is that these inscriptions, though they are mortuary inscriptions, do not remind us primarily of death. Their dominant sentiment is that of immortality, and through the dark, winding, and narrow passages of the Catacombs, from every rock-hewn tomb, comes, as it were, the voices of the buried martyrs, saints, and confessors proclaiming that "death is swallowed up of victory"—that Christ is the "resurrection and the life."

Another feature of most of these Christian epitaphs is their simplicity—the simplicity of meekness—of men, who, receiving all things as an expression of God's will, claim nothing for themselves but the privilege of submission. This simplicity shows itself even in the names upon their tombs. While those on the Pagan monuments consist of several parts, as "Aurelius Felix" or "Victor Septimus Servus," only a single one, generally the baptismal name, is in most cases to be found on the Christian tombs. Sometimes this name is the sole mark over the grave, unless it be some rudely carved emblem of the faith. None of the high-sounding titles of Roman citizenship, nor the long formal praises so common in such inscriptions, are there recorded. It would almost seem as though the mere fact that the dead departed this life in the Christian faith, was the sole record concerning them that was considered worthy of being preserved. If any title be added to the brief statement of the name and age of the deceased, it is one expressive of the Christian profession, or an allusion to some Christian virtue.

CVRRENTINO
SERVO DEI.

To Currentinus—the servant of God.

MAXIMINVSQV
IVIXIT ANNOS XXIII
AMICVS OMNIVM.

Maximinus who lived 23 years: a friend of all.

Sometimes the inscription is in Greek.

Ε ΚΑΛΑΝ ΝΟΕΝΒ.
ΕΚΟΙΜΗΘΗ ΓΟΡΓΟΝΙΟ
ΠΑΣΙΦΙΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΔΕΝΙ
ΕΧΘΡΟΣ.

On the 5th Kalends of November, slept Gorgonius, friend of all and enemy to none.

By no means the least interesting and touching part of the story which these inscriptions tell, is to be found in the expressions of parental and conjugal affection, and in the little details concerning the deceased and of their home-life, which they contain, and which though trivial in themselves, from their naturalness and simplicity, speak to us with a pathos, from which, even the dust of centuries, has failed to rob the freshness.

CECILIVS. MARITVS CECILIAE PLACIDINAE
COIVGI OPTIME MEMORIAE CVM QVA
VIXI ANNIS X. BENE SE. NE. VLLA
QVERELLA IXΘYC.

Cecilius the husband, to Cecilia Placidina my wife, of excellent memory, with whom I lived well 10 years without any quarrel—In Christ.

DOMNINAE
NNOCENIISSINAE. ET DVLCISSIMAE COIVGI
QVAE VIXIT ANN XVI. M IIII. ET FVIT.
IMARITATA. ANN DVOBVS. M. IIII. D. VIIII.
CVM QVA NON LICVIT FVISSE. PROPTER
CAVSAS PEREGRINATIONIS
NISI. MENSIBVS. VI
OVO. TEMPORE. VTEGOSENSI EI EXHBVI
AMOREM MEVM
NVLLIS VALII. SIC DILEXERVNT
DEPOSIT. XV KAL. IVN.

To Domnina, my sweetest and most innocent wife, who lived 16 years and 4 months, and was married 2 years, 4 months and 9 days: with whom I was not able to live, on account of my travels, more than six months, during which time I showed her my love as I felt it. None else so loved each other. Buried on the 15th Kalends of June.

IN PACE
AVRELIO FELICI QVI BIXIT CVM COIVCE.
ANNOS. X. VIII DVLCIS. IN COIVGIO.
BONE MEMORIE BIXIT. ANNOS. L. V.
RAPTVS ETERNE DOMVS. XII KAL. IENVARIAS.

In Peace—To Aurelius Felix, who lived with his wife eighteen years in sweetest wedlock. Of good memory. He lived 55 years. Snatched home eternally the 12th Kalends of January.

B. M.
CVBICVLVM. AVRELIAE. MARTINAE CASTISSIMAEADQVE. PVDICISSIMAE FEMINAE QVE FECIT. IN COIVGIO ANN. XXIII D XIIII BENE MERENTI. QVE VIXIT. ANN. XL. M. XI. D. XIII. DEPOSITIO EIS DIE. III. NONAS. OCT. NEPOTIANO. ET FACVNDO CONSS. IN PACE.

To the well-deserving—The chamber of Aurelia Martina, my wife, most chaste and modest, who lived in wedlock 23 years and 14 days. To the well-deserving one who lived 40 years, 11 months and 13 days. Her burial was on the 3d Nones of October. Nepotianus and Facundus being consuls [i. e. A. D. 336] in peace. *

The following may have been erected by a wife to her husband, but it is usually regarded as commemorating the love of two as yet unjoined in wedlock.

CLAVDIO BENEMERENTI
STVDIOSO QVI AMABIT ME. VIX
AN. P. M. XXV IN P.

To Claudius the well-deserving and affectionate who loved me. He lived 25 years more or less. In peace.

Perhaps the most touching epitaphs are those found on the tombs of children. The following are inimitable for their tenderness and beauty.

SEVERO FILIO DVL-
CISSIMO LAVRENTIVS
PATER BENEMERENTI QVI BI
XIT ANN. IIII. ME. VIII. DIES. V.
ACCERSITVS AB ANGELIS VII. IDVS IANVA.

Laurence the father, to his sweetest, well-deserving son, Severus, who lived 4 years, 8 months and 5 days. Borne away by angels the 7th Ides of January.

* The only means that there is of fixing the date of these epitaphs is by the consuls who are mentioned in them as governing during the years in which they were erected. The earliest date of this sort that has been found is A. D. 98.—The consulships of Anicius Festus and Virius Gallus. The latest date is probably A. D. 472, in the consulship of Festus. The inscription containing this latter date is quoted on page 612.

SPIRITO SANCTO
INNOCENTI QVI
VIXIT AN. PL. M. III.

To the holy soul Innocent, who lived 3 years more or less.

In one case we have the length of life expressed with unusual precision, showing how dear to the parents' hearts was every little circumstance connected with their lost child.

DEFVNTVS K SEPT.
POMPEIANO INNO-
CENTIOVIVIXII
ANN VI MESES. VIIII
DIES VIII ORAS IIII
DORMIT IN PACE.

Died on the Kalends of September, Pompeianus the innocent, aged 6 years, 9 months, 8 days and 4 hours. He sleeps in peace.

In none of these inscriptions, not even in the inscriptions commemorative of those who suffered martyrdom for their faith, is to be found a single word of bitterness against the persecutors. In very few cases is the manner of death mentioned, and those few all belong to the later persecutions, and among all the rude paintings and carvings of the Catacombs, but one representation of a martyrdom has been found. To look at the Catacombs alone, it might be supposed that persecution had in Rome no victims, since Christianity has in them made no allusion to suffering. The following are some of the few epitaphs in which martyrdom is plainly mentioned.

PRIMITVS IN PACE QVI POST
MVLTAS ANGVSTIAS FORTISSIMVS MARTYR
ET VIXIT ANNOS P. M. XXXVIII CONIVG. SVO
PERDVLCISSIMO BENEMERENTI FECIT.

Primitius in peace. A most valiant martyr after many torments, Aged 38 years more or less. His wife made (this) to her dearest well-deserving (husband.)

LANNVS XPI. MA-
RTIRHICREQVIESC-
IT. SUB DIOCLITIANO
PASSUS.

Lannus, a martyr of Christ, rests here. He suffered under Diocletian.

The next, it would seem, was erected during a time of actual persecution.

TEMPORE ADRIANI IMPERATORIS MA-
RIVS ADOLESCENS DVX MILITVM QVI
SATIS VIXIT DVM VITAM PRO CHO
CVM SANGVINE CONSVNSIT IN PACE
TANDEM QVIEVIT BENEMERENTES
CVM LACRIMIS ET METV POSVERVNT
I.D. VI.

In the time of the Emperor Adrian, Marius, a young military officer who had lived long enough, when, with his blood he gave up his life for Christ. At length he rested in peace. The well-deserving set up this with tears and in fear, the 6th Ides of December.

The briefest, and yet the most forcible inscription of this class reads: "*Clementia tortured, dead, sleeps, will rise.*" Another records the martyrdom of a whole family. It is difficult to decipher, being mostly in Greek character, while the inscription itself is in Latin, and it is besides so bad in point of grammar as to be almost untranslatable. Its supposed intended reading is given by Maitland to be—*Hic Gordianus Galliæ nuncius, jugulatus pro fide, eum familia tota; quiescunt in pace.*" In times of violent persecution, it would seem from inscriptions, such as the following, which are occasionally found in the Catacombs, that a number of the victims would be buried in one grave.

MARCELLA ET CHRISTI
MARTYRES
C C C C L

Modern antiquarians have exercised their ingenuity in deciding what symbols were used by the early Christians to designate the tombs of their martyrs, but everything tends to show that except in a few cases, of which examples have been given, no marks were placed upon the tombs of the martyrs in order to designate them as such. Martyrdom was in all probability, the most common cause of death among the early followers of Christ in Rome—a form of death, with which they were not only familiar, but also one, of which they themselves must often have been in daily expectation. The symbols found on so many of their

tombs, which the antiquarians would have us regard as marks designating martyrdom, are rather emblems of the common faith in which all died. Such emblems for example as the palm branch, the crown, and the sacramental cup, for which this character have been claimed, are all of them found on the graves of children whose years would preclude their having been martyrs, and also on tombs belonging to years during which there were no persecutions. Representations of certain instruments which are carved on some of the tombs, and which are by some considered as instruments of torture, should properly be regarded as simply designating the trade and occupation of the deceased; a view which is supported by the fact that similar instruments have been found in some of the tombs, being placed there from a sentiment, on the part of surviving friends of the deceased, that it is easy to understand, and which also accounts for the presence of the toys that have been found in the graves of children in the same locality. The fact is that the faith of the early Christians was too strong, and their visions of glory too vivid, to suffer them to lament over the heroes who had so nobly finished their course in glorious victory;—

> "Strange conquest, where the conqueror must die,
> And he is slain that wins the victory."

Of course it is more than probable that many of the graves bearing these emblems are in fact the graves of martyrs, but to suppose that they were designated as such in this manner, is contrary to the spirit of the early Roman Christians, as that spirit is made manifest in the Catacombs. The dismal pictures of martyrdom that now meet the eye at every step in foreign galleries and churches, are the signs of a period when a gloomy spirit had taken possession of the Church, and when she was ready to inflict the same cruelties upon all who did not submit to her teachings. Painters have vied with each other in representing the martyrs in states of seraphic abstraction under their torments, eyes glazing in death and faces illumined with reflections of the glories of Paradise; angels in attendance to bear away in triumph the victorious spirit, and the Great Captain

himself, from the heavenly heights above, cheering the sufferer with glimpses of the crown that awaits his victory. A Guido and a Caracci may have found such subjects favorable to the display of their transcendent genius, and even the coldest Protestant, as he gazes upon their matchless productions, cannot but feel a thrill of sympathy and reverence. But the early Christians needed no artist's pencil—for them, the sufferings of the martyrs, and the bright examples of their lives and victorious triumph, were realities which their eyes had witnessed. Thus in the dark passages of the Catacombs, like the dead in some vast national battle-field cemetery, they lie—The "noble army of martyrs"—a "host that no man can number,"—

"Quorum solus habet comperta vocabula Christus."

Hence also it is that the Catacombs have been ransacked in vain for some trace, cotemporary with the persecutions, of the superstitious reverence, with which the memory of the martyrs and their mortal remains came to be regarded, soon after the cessation of persecution, or of the idolatry into which that reverence afterwards developed.

These remarks naturally lead to some consideration of the emblems, found in connection with the inscriptions of the Catacombs. Allusion has already been made to the fact, which is no where more apparent than in the Catacombs, that by far the large majority of the early Christians belonged to the uneducated and illiterate classes of the community. This very ignorance drove them to some sort of symbolism, and compelled them to resort to some sort of representation, that would address them through the eye directly.

The symbols found in the Catacombs are of two classes. Those which are descriptive of the persons whom they commemorate, and those which relate to the profession of the Christian religion. Of the first class we have in the first place, symbolic figures which phonetically convey the name of the deceased. The carvings of these symbols are in all cases rude and inartistic, but their intention is plain. The following inscription is accompanied by the carving of a lion, which would at once

recall the name of the deceased to his unlettered friends, to whom the words of the epitaph would have been unintelligible.

PONTIVS. LEO. S. EBIV
ET PONTIA. M
FECERVNT, FI*

The epitaph of Navira is a well-known example of this class of inscriptions—it is accompanied by a representation of a ship.

NABIRA IN PACE ANIMA DVLCIS
QVI BIXIT ANOS. XVI M V
ANIMA MELEIEA
TITVLV FACTV
APARENTES SIGNVM NABE.

Navira in peace. A sweet soul who lived 16 years, 5 months; a soul (sweet) like honey. The epitaph was made by her parents—the sign a ship.

The next is accompanied by the carving of a pig, and the one following, by that of two casks or barrels.

PORCELLA HIC DORMIT
IN P. QVIXIT ANN. III M. X
D. XIII

Porcella sleeps here in peace.—She lived 3 years, 10 months, 13 days.

IVLIO FILIO PATER DOLIENS

Doliens the father, to Julius the son.

Porcella is the Latin for a little pig, and Dolium signifies a cask. So likewise the tomb of Dracontius exhibits a dragon, and that of Onager an ass. To this class of symbols belong all those inscriptions which are accompanied by representations of instruments of labor, as the adze, the saw, implements of woolcombers, &c., as they were intended to indicate the trade of the deceased.

But by far the larger number of the symbols found in the Catacombs, refer to the faith professed by the deceased. The first of these which claims our attention, is the one which the Christians from all time seem to have intuitively assumed as

* Maitland translates this inscription as follows: "Pontius Leo and Pontia Maxima. The former while living bought this tomb. Their sons set up this."

the badge of their faith—the cross. There is probably no more complete a revolution of feeling among mankind, than that which has taken place in respect to the cross. Once an object of horror and a symbol of disgrace, it has become an emblem of our faith, finding its place everywhere, in art, in religion, and even in the very sacraments of the dominant faith of the world, and it has ever been set up as the standard of the Church, wherever she has carried the gospel. "No effort of the imagination can dissipate the illusion of dignity which has gathered around it; it has been so long dissevered from all its coarse and humiliating associations, that it cannot be cast back and desecrated into its state of opprobrium and contempt.*" The gradual change from the cross to the crucifix, is easily traced in ancient monuments. First occurs the simple cross; next a lamb appears at its foot, then in the third stage we have, "Christ clothed on the cross, with hands uplifted in prayer, but not nailed to it; in the fourth, Christ fastened to the cross with four nails, still living, with open eyes. He was not represented as dead till the tenth or eleventh century."† But in undergoing this change the original character of the symbol was entirely lost; from being a token of joy and a symbol of triumph, it became a thing of tears and agony. A stock subject with artists in which to display their power of representing anguish, until the last glimmerings of divine majesty suffered a total eclipse from the exclusive display of agonized humanity. In the Catacombs, however, no trace of this is to be found. There it is nowhere found except in its simplest form of two straight lines. If any addition is made to it, the same simple form is preserved, while it is represented surrounded with palm branches, crowned with flowers, or accompanied by a dove, the emblem of peace.

The most common symbol found in connection with the inscriptions of the Catacombs, is a monogram of our Lord's name, composed of a *X* and a P combined, the first two letters of *Χριστος*. Sometimes it is found surrounded by palm branches,

---

* Milman, Bampton Lectures, p 279.

† Milman, Hist. of Christianity, v. iii. p. 515.

which are much used in these inscriptions as typifying the victory and triumph of the faith. Occasionally a variation is found in the decussation (as it is technically termed) of the *X* by which the figure of a cross is produced, and in time this seems to have become the fixed form of the symbol. In connection with it are also to be found the *A* and *Ω*. All of these symbols are present on a seal ring that was found in the Catacombs some years since.

A very common symbol of this class is the *Fish*, a symbol in which the early Christians especially delighted, and which is remarkable as affording a combination of everything desirable in a tessera or mystic sign. The idea is derived from the Greek word for fish, *ιχθυς*, which contains the initials of the words *Ιησους Χριστος, Θεου Υιος, Σωτηρ*; Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour. It would be a symbol whose meaning would be entirely concealed from the unbelievers. Sometimes, as in the epitaph of Cæcilia Placidina, quoted on page 601, the word *ιχθυς* is expressed at length, and sometimes the fish itself is figured. As early as A. D. 194, St. Clement of Alexandria makes allusion to this symbol, and both he and Tertullian speak of the fitness of its use by those whose spiritual birth came to them in the waters of baptism.

The dove has already been alluded to. It undoubtedly signified "Peace in God." In some of the pictures of the Catacombs, however, we find it used as the symbol of the third person of the Godhead. God the Father is never represented in all the paintings and carvings of the Catacombs otherwise than symbolically, generally by a hand projecting from the clouds. The first attempt at a corporeal representation of "the king invisible" is found in an illuminated Bible of about A D. 850. But on the other hand there are numerous representations of our Saviour, both in the character of the Good Shepherd, and in pictures representing the scenes of His life, still it is not a little strange, that not in a single instance, do the early Christians seem to have attempted to represent either His sufferings or His death, and it would seem as though they shrank from the attempt in reverential awe. The nearest approach to any representation

of the events of our Lord's passion, is a carving representing Pilate washing his hands, and several representations of the denial of St. Peter. In the first, the figure of Christ is omitted by the artist, and all the representations of the denial of St. Peter seem to represent not the actual denial, but the scene where Jesus prophesies to Peter that he will deny Him before the cock crows thrice.

On some of the tombs is found an anchor, signifying the close of a well-spent life, the conclusion of a successful voyage. Life could hardly have seemed to the persecuted followers of Christ, other than a stormy voyage, and the anchor was an expression of confidence that he who slept beneath it had reached the haven of eternal safety. A similar idea must have dictated the choice of a ship as an emblem of the Church, an emblem borrowed from the heathen, with whom it was a favorite symbol of the close of life. The drawing is always very rude. Occasionally the mast is drawn in the shape of a cross, and in one of the later specimens St. Peter and St. Paul are represented as steering it. The Peacock and the Phœnix are also occasionally used as emblems of immortality, and the cock seems to have been used as the symbol of the vigilance recommended by our Lord. Of the supposed emblems of martyrdom, the palm branch and the crown, mention has already been made. Both were borrowed from paganism, but to the Christian they derived their significance from the mention made of them in the book of Revelation.

With regard to the execution of all these emblems, and of all the paintings and carvings accompanying them, and representing the scenes of our Lord's life and of scriptural history, we cannot do otherwise than adopt the words of an eminent writer on the subject: "Considered as works of art, it must be confessed they are but poor productions—the meagreness of invention only equaled by the feebleness of execution—inferior, generally speaking, to the worst specimens of cotemporary heathen art."* And yet, laying aside artistic criticism, it will be

* Lord Lindsay's Christian Art—vol. 1, p. 39.

found that in these rude and inartistic carvings, primitive Christianity engraved its creed and recorded the purity and simplicity of its faith. Among the thousands of emblems and representations of scriptural scenes that have been found in the Catacombs, there has not been found a single one of any authenticity, that gives any countenance to the errors which subsequently were engrafted upon the faith. Rude and unskilful as is the embodiment of the thought, and telling of the haste of times of persecution and peril, still the thought and idea of the representation is always in accordance with Scripture, and show the purity of a faith refined in the hot furnace of affliction.

Being all of a mortuary character, only such traces of the government, ministry and offices of the early Roman Church as would properly have their place in such inscriptions are to be found in them. The highest order of the ministry of the Roman Church was that of Bishop, Episcopus, or Papa. Of this rank were those whom the following epitaphs commemorate:

PERPETVAM SEDEM NVTRITOR POSSIDES IPSE
HIC MERITVS FINEM MAGNIS DEFVNCTE PERICLIS
HIC REQVIEM FELIX SVMIS COGENTIBVS ANNIS
HIC POSITVS PAPA SANTIMIOO VIXIT ANNIS LXX
DEPOSITVS DOMINO NOSTRO ARCADIO II ET FL
RVFINO
VVCCSS NONA NOBEMB

You our nursing father, occupy a perpetual seat, being dead and deserving an end to your great dangers. Here happy you find rest, bowed down with years. Here is buried the most holy Pope, who lived 70 years. Buried on the Nones of November, our Lords Arcadius for the second time, and Flavius Rufinus being consuls.

HVNC MIHI COMPOSVIT TVMVLVM LAVRENTIA
CONIVX
MORIBVS APTA MEIS. SEMPER VENERANDA. FIDELIS.
INVIDIA INFELIX TANDEM COMPRESSA QVIESCIT
OCTAGINTA LEO TRANSCENDIT EPISCOPVS ANNOS.

My wife Laurentia made me this tomb; she was ever suited to my disposition, venerable and faithful. At length disappointed envy lies crushed. The bishop Leo survived his 80th year.

The first of these epitaphs shows not only the antiquity of the title of *papa*, but also that that title was not then restricted

to the incumbent of the Roman See. The consuls mentioned in it fix A. D. 392 as the date of the bishop's death, a year in which no bishop of Rome died, it being during the episcopacy of Siricius, which extended from A. D. 385 to A. D. 396. The second epitaph is strong evidence that this, the highest order of the Christian ministry, was then not forbidden to marry, as are the first two of the following inscriptions as to the clergy of the second rank, the priests, presbyters or pastors.

LEVITAE CONIVNX PETRONIA FORMA PVDORIS
HIS MEA DEPONENS SEDIBVS OSSA LOCO
PARCITE VOS LACRIMIS DVLCES CVM CONIVGE
NATAE
VIVENTEMQUE DEO CREDITE FLERE NEFAS
DP IN PACE III NON OCTOBRIS FESTO VC CONSS.

Petronia, a priest's wife, a type of modesty. In this place I lay my bones. Spare your tears, dear husband and daughters, and believe that it is forbidden to weep for one who lives in God. Buried in peace on the 3d Nones of October in the Consulate of Festus, (i. e. in A. D. 472.)

OLIM PRESBYTERI GABINI FILIA FELIX
HIC SVSANNA IACET IN PACE PATRI
SOCIATA.

Once the happy daughter of the presbyter Gabinus, here lies Susanna, joined with her father in peace.

LOCVS BASILI PRESB ET FELICITATI EIVS
SIBI FACERVNT

The place of Basilus, the Presbyter, and his Felicitas. They made it for themselves.

LOCVS VALENTINI PRESB.

The place of Valentinius, the presbyter.

ACATIVS. PASTOR.

Acantius, the pastor.

The lowest order of the ministry were the deacons, of one of whom the following is the brief epitaph :

LOCVS EXVPERANTI
DEACON.

The place of Exuperantius, the deacon.

In addition to these regular orders of the ministry, there seems to have been other offices in the Church of Rome as then organized, some of which were probably preparatory to admission into the holy ministry. Such were the *lectors* or readers, whose duty it was to read the Scriptures aloud in the church. It would seem that they were allowed to marry.

CLAVDIVS. ATTICIA
NVS LECTOR
ET CLAVDIA
FELICISSIMA
COIVX

Claudius Atticanus, the lector, and Claudia Felicissima, his wife.

In some cases they were appointed while still very young, probably being devoted to the service of God by their parents, in which case they were trained and disciplined, in inferior offices of this sort in order to prepare them for positions of higher usefulness in the Church. The following is the epitaph of such an infant reader:

LOCVS AVGVSTI
LECTORIS DEBELA
BRV
DEPSVRICA XGKAL.
AVG.
QVE VIXIT ANNOS
PMXIICONS
SEBERINI.*

Of the office of exorcist we now know but little. Satan, as we learn from the Scriptures and the writings of the early Fathers, seems to have been permitted in those early years of the church, to exercise a strange influence over the bodies of men; a belief in demoniacal possession was then universal, and a miraculous power was granted to the members of the Church to cast him out. But as this form of manifestation of Satan's power ceased, which must have been soon after the time of the apos-

* Maitland translates this epitaph as follows: "The place of Augustus, Lector in the Velabrum, buried in a mound on the 15th Kalends of August. He lived 12 years more or less. In the Consulate of Severinus (A. D. 461.)"

tles, and with the cessation of miracles which probably took place by degrees, the office of exorcist became a settled one in the church, and it was, at least nominally, retained until a late period.* The title is found in the following epitaph, which is also an example of a class of inscriptions by no means rare in the Catacombs, inscribed upon a stone already containing an inscription of heathen origin.†

D. M.
VALERIVS. QVI
VIXIT. IN. SAECVLO
ANN. XI. M. X. D. V.
IANVARIVS. EXORCISTA
SIBI. ET. CONIVGI. FECIT.

The lowest rank among the officers of the church was that of *fossor*. It seems to have been the office of the fossors to take charge of funerals and to bury the dead. Some writers of the Roman church would find a trace of the existence of this office in apostolic times in the persons of the "young men" who carried out the bodies of Ananias and Sapphira. The office probably survived in that of parish sexton. The fossors seem to have been entrusted with the care and enlargement of the Catacombs, and with the digging of the graves. Among the paintings found in the Catacombs, are many rude representations of the fossors engaged in their work, or surrounded by the implements of their calling. One of these paintings has often been copied. It represents the fossor standing in a sort of chapel lined with tombs. Over one shoulder he holds the pick used for excavating, and in the other hand a lamp, similar in shape to lamps of terra cotta still occasionally found in the

* In Foxe's Martyrology it is stated, that before Huss was executed he was degraded from his orders in succession, priesthood, deaconship, sub-deaconship, Acolyteship, and the offices of *exorcist* and sexton.

† Sometimes the pagan inscription has been chiseled out.

Several slabs have been found with a Christian inscription on one side, and a much older but pagan inscription on the other. There are good reasons for supposing that portions of the Catacombs were used by the poor of Rome, as a place of burial long before the Christians. Certain portions seem to have been made a similar use of by the Jews.

Catacombs, suspended from a cord and spike, by which it was fastened to the rock in order to light him at his labor. At his feet lie sundry other instruments, while on his dress, which is a simple tunic with sleeves, falling below the knees, is figured the cross, as a token of his Christian profession. Over his head is the inscription :—

DIOGENES. FOSSOR. IN. PACE. DEPOSITVS
OCTABV. KALENDAS. OCTOBRIS.

Numerous epitaphs of the fossors are extant, but they are all extremely brief. From allusions contained in many inscriptions, it would seem that the fossors had also the power of disposing of the graves.

EMPTVM LOCVM A BARTEMISTVM
VISOMVM HOC EST ET PRETIVM
DATVM A FOSSORI HILARO ID EST
FOLN————————* PRESENTIA SEVERI
FOSS ET LAVARENT.

A place bought by Bartemistus. This is a bisomum, and the price was paid to the fossor Hilarus; it was 1400 folles, in the presence of Severus and Laurentius the fossors.

The follis was a small Roman coin, of which forty made a denarius. The market value of a Bisomum (a grave holding two bodies) therefore, was about $5.60 of our currency. The following records a similar transaction :

IOVINVS. SIBICOM
PARAVIT. ABICTORI
NO. BISOMV. LOCVET
EXVPERV. COLLEGAIPSI.

Jovinus bought himself (this) bisomum from Victorinus and Exuperus, his partner.

These last two inscriptions can scarcely be called epitaphs. They are rather legal conveyances of a portion of the Catacombs. A *bisomum* was a grave for two bodies, and is a term of frequent occurrence in these inscriptions; there were also the *trisomum* and *quadrisomum*, holding respectively three and

* It is impossible to reproduce with type the symbols that stand for the numerals, so I have left it blank. The curious may see them in Maitland, on page 68.

four bodies, but inscriptions referring to them are not numerous. Many of the inscriptions of the character of these last two were probably placed upon the tombs at the time of their purchase, and others like the following were partly executed at that time and then finished afterward.

HIC REQVIECET
SAMSO IN BISO
MVM ET VICTORV
SE VIVA VXOREIVS.

Here rests Samso in a bisomum, and Victoria, his wife, she being alive.

The custom of selecting a place of sepulchre while still alive seems, from the number of inscriptions containing allusions to it, to have been a common one. The custom must have originated in the strong feeling of respect for the body after death that characterized the early Christians, a feeling to which the Catacombs themselves owe their origin, and that was not only inherited by the Christians from their immediate religious ancestors, the Jews, but which was also enhanced, and made to enter into the very constitution and nature of their life by the great crowning event of their faith, the Resurrection of Christ.

Of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it can hardly be expected that any trace should be found among these inscriptions, and the few epitaphs that are claimed as having reference to it, are of such doubtful authenticity that it is better to pass over them unnoticed. In regard to baptism, there are a few epitaphs of children, that would seem to show that infant baptism was then practised by the church.

ROMANO NEOFITO
BENEMERENTI QVI VI
XIT, ANNOS. VIII. DXV
REQVIESCIT. IN. PACE, DN
FL. GRATIANO. AVG. II. ET
PETRONIO PROBO. CS.

To Romanus, the well-deserving neophyte, who lived 8 years and 15 days, he rests in peace. Florius Gratian Augustus for the second time and Publius Probus being consuls. (A. D. 371.)

FL. IOVINA. QVAE. VIX
ANNIS. TRIBVS. D. XXX
NEOFITA. IN PACE. XI. K.

Flavia Jovina, who lived 3 years, 30 days, a neophyte, (she) died in peace the 11th Kalends.

VCILIANVS BACIO VALERIO
QVI BISIT AN. VIIII
VIII. DIES XXII CATECVM.

Ucilianus, to Bacius Valerius, a Catechumen, who lived 9 years, 8 months and 22 days.

TEG CANDIDVS NEOF
Q. VXT. M XXI. DP NON
SEP.

The title of Candidus, the neophyte, who lived 21 months, buried on the Nones of September.

In some of the subterranean chapels and crypts of the Catacombs have been found fonts, whence it would seem that the rite of baptism must often have been celebrated in such places. On such a font, now in the Lapidarian gallery, the following inscription may still be deciphered:—

CORPORIS ET CORDIS MACVLAS VITALI
PVRGAT ET OMNE SIMVL ABLVITVND.

The living stream cleanses the spots of the body as well as of the heart, and at the same time washes away all (sin.)

That font is now broken, and within it no drop of water can now be found, but from it has indeed issued a living stream that, with the power of a resistless flood, has washed away the more than Augean filth of pagan Rome.

Thus far, I have endeavored to set before the reader the feelings and the customs of the Roman Christians of the first five centuries, as those feelings and customs appear to be set forth and illustrated by the inscriptions of the Catacombs. In doing so I have sought to let the inscriptions speak for themselves, and endeavored to add no more to the story that they tell than seemed absolutely necessary; for I felt that the freshness and simplicity of primitive times, and the plainness and manliness that cling so inseparably to them, could not fail to speak far more eloquently to the reader, and would call up a far more vivid picture of the lives of those whom these

inscriptions commemorate, and of the scenes they must have passed through, than any effort of my pen could have done. Here, therefore, I might well close this article, and gladly would I do so, for to point at errors into which our brother Christians, the successors and descendants of those in whose lives and conversation we have as it were, been participating, have fallen, is far from being in accordance with the feelings such an intercourse has awakened. But what has been said does not complete the testimony of these humble epitaphs. They constitute a record that cannot be impeached, and the Christians of the Nineteenth Century have a right to seek among them for evidence, as to what was the teaching and practice of the early Catholic and Apostolic Church, with respect to questions which have separated the Church, into the opposing camps of Romanism and Protestantism. And it is the more important that this should be done, as there are among these records, inscriptions which have been claimed as giving countenance to doctrines and practices that are regarded as erroneous by the larger portion of Christendom.

While from the epitaphs of the members of the clergy which have been quoted, it is clear that forced celibacy was unknown in the Roman Church of the first four centuries, still there are some inscriptions which have been considered as showing that it was then not unusual for members of the Church to fix voluntarily upon celibacy or widowhood in order to devote themselves wholly to the service of God. The epitaphs of this class are not very numerous, and they all are epitaphs of women. They neither throw much light upon the subject, nor do they go far towards showing that celibacy was at all common in the Roman Church at that time. In fact it may safely be doubted whether they have any reference to the subject. The following are a few examples.

FVRIA HELPIS
VIRGO DEVOTA.

Furia Elpis—A consecrated virgin.

HOC EST
SEPVLCHRVM SANCTAE
LVCINÆ VIRGINIS.

This is the sepulchre of the holy virgin Lucina.

OC-TA-VI-AE-MA-TRO-NAE
VI-DV-AE-DE-I.

To Octavia a matron widow of God.*

AESTONIA VIRGO PEREGRI
NA QVE VIXIT ANIS XL. I. ET. DS.
VIII. IIII. KAL. MAR. DECESSIT
DE CORPORE.

Aestonia, a traveling virgin, who lived 41 years and 8 days. She departed from the body on the 4th Kalends of March.

While condemning celibacy, which, like a decayed sepulchre, bears some few fair flowers, but not enough to conceal the loathsome rottenness that nourishes their unnatural bloom, it must not be forgotten that, like most of the errors that the would be wisdom of man has engrafted upon Christianity, it had its origin in the purest and most praiseworthy motives. It would appear from the few inscriptions extant that relate to this subject, that women rather than men sought this manner of serving their master, and it can easily be understood how in times when the rage of persecution was constantly rending the dearest of human ties, many, all of whose earthly hopes being suddenly swept away, would gladly turn to the comfort afforded by self-denying consecration of the remainder of their lives, to those works of mercy and charity which their religion so strongly advocated, and how in them they would find a fulfillment of the promise, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest." The value of the services rendered by such persons in those days of persecution, and the bright example of their lives, which would stand out as striking monuments of fervent piety, probably had no little to do with the gradual introduction into the Church, of an aristocracy of female virtue professing to rise above the *profanum vulgus* of married life.

Whatever may have been the opinions of the early Christians concerning the saints, and especially concerning the Virgin Mary, not a particle of evidence can be found in any of the

* Probably such a widow as St. Paul enumerates the qualifications of in 1st Tim. v. 9, 10.

inscriptions, paintings and carvings of the Catacombs to lead us to suppose that they regarded them as possessing any mediatorial power. No prayer offered to the saints, no *ora pro nobis* addressed to the Virgin has been found on any of the countless graves of the early Christians, that line the passages of the Catacombs, and no pictures of the saints embellish the walls of the subterranean chapels where they worshiped. Representations of the mother of our Lord, it is true, are found, but in all she is introduced only as an accessory to the Divine infant.

Equally at variance with any faith in the expiatory flames of a purgatory, is the testimony of these Christian records. Among the thousands of these epitaphs it is impossible to glean a single expression that gives any countenance to the doctrine, while scattered through them are numerous expressions that are in direct contradiction of it. Can, for instance, the expression "borne away by angels" in the epitaph of Servus, quoted on page 602, or the continual recurrence of epitaphs similar to the following be reconciled with any such belief?

NICEFORVS ANIMA.
DVLCIS IN REFRIGERIO.

Nicephoros, a sweet soul, in the place of refreshment.

ARETVSA
IN DEO.

Arethusa, in God.

MACVS PVER INNOCENS
ESSE IAMINTER INNOCNTIS COEPISTI
QVAM STAVILES TIVI HAEC VITA EST
QVAM TELETVM EXCIPET MATER ECLESIAE DEOC
MVNDO REVERTENTEM COMPREMATVR PEC-
TORVM
GEMITVS STRVATVR FLETVS OCVLORVM.

Marcus, an innocent boy. You have already begun to be among the innocent ones. How enduring is such a life to you! How gladly will your mother, the Church of God, receive you, returning to this world. Let us restrain our sighs and cease from weeping.

Thus these inscriptions give us some clue to the belief of the early Christians concerning the departed souls of the faithful. They are not said to be in heaven, nor in purgatory, but in a state of refreshing by God's presence—in God. These inscriptions

also enable us to properly interpret the meaning of a class of epitaphs, in which the Romanists would fain find evidence that prayers for the dead were used by the early Christians. But the utmost that can be found in them is an ejaculatory wish, the expression of a fond affection that follows the object of its love beyond the grave. The following are the most noted examples of the inscriptions of this class, which is not a very numerous one :—

VAL. SABINA.
VIXIT. ANN. VIII. MENSIB.
VIII. DIES XXXI.
VIVAS. IN. DEO. DVLCIS.

Farewell, O Sabina! She lived 8 years, 8 months and 31 days. Mayest thou live.

EXVPERI. RE. Q.
IN PACE Q. V.
ANN. XXIII ET
M. III. D. VI.

Exuperius mayest thou rest in peace, who lived 23 years, 3 months and 6 days.

IN PACE. ET BENEDICTIONE
SVFSVATE VIXIT ANIS XXX PLVS MINVS
REDDIDIT XAL. FEBR.

Mayest thou be in peace and benediction, O Sufsuatus! He lived 30 years, more or less. He departed in the Kalends of February.

FAVSTINA. DVLCIS. BIBAS.
IN. DEO.

Sweet Faustina, may you live in God.

BOLOSA DEVS TI
BIREFRIGERET QVAE VI
XIT ANNOS XXXI RECESSIT
DIE XIII KAL OCTB.

Boloso, may God refresh thee. She lived 31 years. She departed on the thirteenth Kalends of October.

AMERIMNVS
RVFINAE. COIV
GICARIS. SIME
BENEMEREN-
TI SPIRITVM.
TVVM DEVS
REFRI. GERET.

Amerimnus, to Rufina, my dearest wife, the well-deserving. May God refresh thy spirit.

And thus it is with every one of the doctrines and practices in which the modern Church of Rome differ from the rest of Christianity. Not one of them can find any support in these primitive records. In any modern Roman Catholic cemetery—in any burial ground whose graves date back to the 11th or 12th Centuries,— on almost every grave, whether it be the marble mausoleums of the Popes who sleep beneath the lofty dome of St. Peter's, or the low green mound of some Jesuit missionary in the virgin forests of America, will be found epitaphs, that unequivocally intimate the belief of the Church of Rome. There is a statement setting forth that it is well to pray for the dead—a request to the passer-by to offer such a prayer—petitions in behalf of the dead addressed to the Virgin and to the Saints. If a belief in any of these things was held among those members of the Roman Church who lie buried in the Catacombs, and who, as the immediate successors of the Apostles, form the connecting links between the Roman Church subsequent to the 6th century and the Church of apostolic times, there ought to be, and there would be, some evidence of such a belief in the epitaphs upon their graves. The absence—the total absence of anything of the kind is most conclusive. Thus Rome bears within her own bosom the proof of that early purity from which she herself has wandered. On the walls of the Catacombs the spirit and faith of the first ages is indelibly stamped—the elements of a pure faith written "with an iron pen," on the rock forever.

NOTE.—I cannot close without acknowledging my indebtedness to "*The Church in the Catacombs*," by Chas. Maitland, M. D., published in England in 1846, of which I have made free use while compiling this article. It is the only work of any research upon the subject in our language, and it contains by far the largest and most accurate collection of these interesting inscriptions.

J. L. F.

Art. VIII.—CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCH.

Christianity is the absolute religion. If we regard religion in its most general character as "the union of God and man," it will be found that the Christian religion alone possesses true, substantial being, corresponding to this conception, while all heathen, or world, religions are without true substance. In these religions the gulf of separation between God and man is not bridged over. The mythologies of heathenism, with their wonderful play of religious phantasy, as compared with Christianity, are like dreams in relation to the waking state, like shadows in relation to the substance. It is true, that underneath all these creations of the phantasy there is the relation which holds between God and man in the order of the natural creation, a relation which involves an immanent presence of God in the world, and on the part of man a certain sense or apprehension, though imperfect and distorted, of this presence; but still God and man do not here come into any proper, substantial union. To bring about such union, a new self-revelation and self-communication of God to man was required, and an apprehension or appropriation of the divine heavenly gift by man. This, indeed, may be taken to be a correct definition of Christianity, as given by a German writer (Kling), that it is "objectively the self-revelation and self-communication of God in and through the person of Christ, raising humanity to proper destined perfection; subjectively the appropriation of the divine gift by faith on the part of man."

The fundamental basis or beginning of Christianity, therefore, is to be found in the incarnation of the Son of God, in which the Word was made flesh—God became man for us men and for our salvation. As outside of Christ there is no incarnation, so outside of Christianity there is no true and substantia religion, no real binding together of God and man.

But while the substantial basis of Christianity is to be found in the incarnation of the Son of God, it was not until another event that Christianity, as a new order of spiritual life for man, actually entered the current of human history—I mean the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. It was then that the fruits of the union of God and man in the person of Christ, of His sinless life, His atoning death, His resurrection and ascension, were made over to man in the communication of the Saviour's glorified life to his inmost spiritual being. This involved the establishment of the Christian Church, which dates its proper beginning from the day of Pentecost.

We propose to consider in this article *the relation between Christianity and the Church.*

In order to gain a proper conception of Christianity in its essential nature as religion, we must commence with the union of the God and man in the person of Christ. This union is a personal union. The factors that enter into it are, on the one side, God, in the second person of the adorable Trinity, and on the other side, man. The human that the Logos assumed into union with His divine nature, was not an individual man, but humanity in its principial integrity, denominated by St. John *flesh.* "The Word was made flesh." It was our life in its universality that He thus elevated into union with the divine. Christ came thus to stand not merely as *a* man among men, but as *the* man, the absolute generic head of the race, in whom man is to find his completion and perfection.

If now the principle of Christianity is the glorified life of Christ, the generic head of the race, made present for our appropriation by faith through the Holy Ghost, it will at once appear that it involves in it the social principle. It apprehends men, not as separate, isolated individuals, to regenerate and sanctify each one independently, but it immediately organizes a community. Its life is a community life, of which each partakes, and thus we have an organization called the Christian Church, as the form in which Christianity, from the first, exists in the world.

The preparation for the Church during the earthly life of Christ was a society, a community, which was gathered out of Judaism, instructed and made ready for the entrance into it of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. When the Spirit came with the fulness of heavenly endowments, He came at once upon the assembly. They were already joined together in the possession of a common faith. The susceptibility for inspiration was quickened within them by the withdrawal of the visible presence of Christ. When the Spirit came, it was as a community they received Him, and thus the Christian Church was born with the entrance of Christianity into the world. The nature of the new life with which they were inspired rendered this necessary, for it was a life which was to be common to all. The same Spirit that came to bind them to Christ the Head, bound them at the same time to one another. Just as from the bosom of the old humanity men were born into the natural community, born with social capacities and into social relations, so from the bosom of the new, regenerated humanity, men were new-born as a Christian community.

They were born into this new kingdom as ministry and laity. Both sides were represented in the assembly of one hundred and twenty gathered in the upper room in Jerusalem, and they were in possession of all the necessary appointments of the new community. The apostles had been called and commissioned to be teachers and rulers in the Church by Christ before He left the earth. They had received all necessary instruction for their office and work. The sacraments had been instituted. With the apostles, the teachers, were joined the members, the taught. They only waited for the inspiration that was to constitute their new spiritual life. This inspiration carried with it the rich variety of gifts of the Spirit. There was inspiration to teach, to administer the sacraments, and to govern, and the inspiration to apprehend the gospel preached, and to obey the precepts of the same. The inspiration was a spirit of new brotherhood in Christ, for it was one spirit and one life that entered all.

From this it will appear that the advent of Christianity and

the birth and organization of the church were simultaneous. There was not a regeneration of individuals in their separate capacity, who then united and organized the Church as a means or instrumentality for the spread of the new religion. No organism is constituted, in that way, by an external union of the parts. If the church is an organism, like the organism of the race, or of the human body (analogies used in Scripture to set forth its nature), then the membership must be united to their Head, which is Christ, and to each other, by the bond of a common life. The parts can exist only in union with the whole. The relation between the Church and that which constitutes its life is organic. There can be no permanent, substantial existence of Christianity in the world outside of and apart from the Church, and the Church without Christianity would be a corpse.

So far we assert the necessary internal relation of these two over against every theory that would view them as a dualism. Such dualism, indeed, is an impossibility, if we adopt the conception of Christianity which we have presented. If it is, in its deepest essence, the new life which has entered the current of human history from Christ, and continues to flow from Him as its generic head, its perennial source, it cannot be conceived of as standing apart from the Church in its historical development through the ages.

Hence the view that makes a dualism between these two rests on a different conception of Christianity, as well as on a different conception of the Church. If the conception of Christianity be, that it is a system of doctrinal teachings, starting from and based on the Holy Scriptures, or a code of new laws and ethical precepts, resting upon the moral teachings of our Saviour, and that Christians are all those who individually accept these doctrines, and strive to practice these precepts, and be governed by these laws in their individual capacity, then Christianity may be regarded as having an existence in the world as something apart from the Church, and the Church becomes a society organized for the purpose of holding and advancing Christianity as a doctrinal and ethical system. Or if Christianity be viewed more profoundly, as the power of a new

life from Christ through the Holy Ghost, to regenerate men as isolated individuals; and the Church then as a society formed by these regenerate persons, then again there would be a union between the new life and individual Christians, but not a necessary and organic union between Christianity and the Church.

In all such views Christianity is conceived of as not having so come into the world as to become a real constitution in living union with history. They may be compared with that whole class of heretical views of the person of Christ, the Gnostic and Nestorian, according to which the divine never came into living, abiding, personal union with the human. These heresies struck at that fundamental article of the Christian faith—the real entrance of the eternal Word into the order of our human life. They denied that Christ is come into the flesh, which St. John gives as a characteristic of anti-Christ. The divine hovers over the human in a ghostly way, inspires it, it may be, but never comes into union with it. The human then, on the other hand, is either resolved into an appearance merely, or else it is viewed as human and mortal only, without the glorifying power and agency of the divine continually filling it in the successive stages of its growth.

The error to which we have referred may not only be compared with this, but it grows out of it. A false view of the person of Christ necessarily leads to a corresponding false view of Christianity in its relation to the Church. In this latter case, Christianity is resolved into a spirit which hovers over the world. The susceptible human spirit rises to catch its inspiration, and so far as it becomes imbued with the inspiration or afflatus it is Christianized. Not entering truly into the human it does not become historical. It has no stages of development. It is the same from age to age. The history of the Church becomes a history of the degrees in which men receive or apprehend it, just as we may investigate how far the principles of Plato may have been apprehended by his followers from age to age. The relation is that of a system to a school. In such a theory the Church is not a mystery for faith as set forth in

the Apostles' Creed, and the study of its history is shorn of its chief interest.

Until within a recent period this dualistic theory of Church History was the prevailing one in the theological thought of this country. It came in from Puritanism, which was then the ruling spirit in the Reformed Church of America. It had no idea whatever of any organic development in the life of the Church. After the apostolic period Christianity no longer had a home on the earth. It either became sealed up within the pages of the written word which the Church for the most part now lost, or hovered in the air to descend here and there upon individuals and sects, while the main body of the Church moved on blindly without its guidance. The Fathers became ensnared in heathen notions and heathen errors, and their authority entirely useless. The rise of the Episcopacy, the Patriarchate, and especially their natural completion, the Papacy, was a human, yea, diabolical scheme or system, designed only to deceive and betray the faithful. Then when the Church moved into the middle ages, it became entirely buried in superstition and ignorance, with only here and there some scattered prophets to represent the truth, until the new baptism of the Spirit at the Reformation, and the discovery of the Bible dispelled the midnight darkness. This is no caricature. It was the view of the Church in this country, and it was the theory in theological seminaries, as they taught a half, or even a quarter, century ago.

We know the new life and interest, that was awakened among us when the history of Christianity began to be taught in our Institutions according to another scheme. According to this better scheme, which starts from a right view of the incarnation and the person of Christ, primitive Christianity is a legitimate succession of the Christianity of the Apostolic Church, and stands in necessary organic union, with the Church of that period. It was not indeed the same in form with what we find in the New Testament Church. It developed a system of episcopacy, which had no pattern corresponding to it in the Church of the Apostles. It went further. It tended

unmistakably towards a solidarity of the episcopate in the Roman hierarchy, and the Roman system generally, with its monasticism, its worship of saints, and whatever entered legitimately into the constitution of the Church of the middle ages. All this was brought out and pressed home with profound learning, and cogency of argument, as we remember, in the able and searching articles on Early Christianity, and Cyprian, in the "Mercersburg Review," twenty years ago. Was Christianity in organic union with the Church of this period, when the germs of the Roman system already began to reveal themselves? Or must we say that Christianity now took its departure from the world to return again only after more than a thousand years? This latter alternative, adopted by the Puritanic theory, it was felt, was suicidal to all faith in the Church, and a surrender to infidelity. Not even modern episcopacy as it exists in an isolated, national form in the Anglican Church, can find here a model which it claims to have repristinated. Must we then follow Christianity into the Romanism of the middle ages, and hold that this was the form in which it existed during that period? The argument of the articles referred to pressed to this conclusion. They demonstrated that Protestantism is not a repristination of any form of Christianity in previous ages. No support was left even for modern Anglican episcopacy. Must we then become Romanists? By no means. As the early Church was not a copy of the Apostolic Church, but revealed new and different features, and as Romanism revealed new features as compared with primitive Christianity, so we are driven to follow the development of the Church in its new and higher form in Protestantism, and the only theory on which Protestantism can be maintained, is that of historical development, not repristination. This was the argument. It carried in it the very strongest defence for Protestantism that can be made, tearing up by the roots the fallacious theory of Puseyism, or Anglican repristination. And this is the historical argument so egregiously misunderstood by some who may have lacked the ability to apply it, and so wilfully and slanderously misrepresented by others.

A vast change has taken place in American theology during the last quarter of a century, and with it the theory of historical development, as applied to the Church, has come largely into favor. The primitive and mediæval Church is studied not as revealing a lifeless shell, and embodying only the wild freaks of error. We see references now to the ancient Œcumenical creeds, and the primitive liturgies, and the theological systems of the middle ages, of Anselm and Thomas Aquinas, where once these were regarded as fossils only of a bye-gone age, and the truth seems to be more acknowledged, that Christianity lived *in* the Church and not *out* of it during those ages. The idea of tracing the succession of Christianity in a historical form through certain sects, the Paulicians, the Albigenses, and the Waldenses, is pretty much given up. Instead of seeking to parade and magnify the errors and faults of the Church in those earlier ages, with the view of forcing the separation between Christianity and the Church, it has come to be seen, and felt that it is the chief work of the Church historian, to trace, not the workings of error and sin, but the presence and power of the new life of grace in the Church, to subdue these workings. And to all who have faith to see it, there is that in the primitive Church, with its grand creeds, its liturgies, its great Councils, its record of persecution and martyrdom, and there is that in the mediæval Church, with its wonderful missionary labor, which brought all barbarian Europe over to Christianity, its theological systems, its works of charity; there is that in the Church of all these ages to authenticate itself as the power of Christianity. It needed reformation, as confessed by its own reforming Councils, and a reformation came forth from its bosom, which brought in the new era of Protestant Christianity. The Reformation is the product of the best energies and gracious powers at work in the Church of the mediæval period, and it is just because Christianity dwelt there that such a reformation was possible. This is not the only case in history in which the old, having given birth to the new, had no power itself to recognize the legitimacy of its own offspring, but turned back to live out the measure of old age in its own way.

But while there is not a dualism between Christianity and the Church, while they are organically united, yet on the other hand they are not *identical.* Unity does not imply identity. In distinction from the abstract idea of a unit, it rather implies a union of different parts or elements. The life and the form of a plant are constituent elements of a unity, but they are not identical. The body and the soul in man constitute one person, but they are not the same. The highest unity in the universe is a unity in trinity.

So also (an example which lies nearer to our purpose) the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, while they do not allow of a dualism, but are bound together in the unity of one personality, yet they are not identical. There is no such mingling or coalescing of the two natures as to constitute one nature, a *tertium quid.* It is only as we properly distinguish between the two natures in Christ, that we can understand at all His proper humanity. The relation must be viewed in such way as not to interfere with the freedom of His human nature. His human will was not coerced, but came freely into union with the divine will. So the whole development of His human intellect,—yea, His physical, mental, and moral nature developed freely under the influence of the immanent presence of the Godhead in His person.

The relation between Christianity and the Church is not just the same as the union between the divine and human natures in the person of Christ. It is not a hypostatic union of the divine and the human. The Church is not a continuation of the incarnation in any such sense as to involve pantheism, or rather pan-Christism. The life of Christ, which is the essence of Christianity, is the life that flows from Him as the generic head of the church, and does not involve any confusion of His personal being with the church, any more than the life of Adam which flows to all his descendants involves a confusion of the personality of Adam as a man and the independent personalities of his descendants. There is a generic life and a personal life. Christ is over and above His Church while He also lives and dwells in it.

But the relation of the two natures in the person of Christ, finds an analogy in the relation between Christianity and the Church, and especially does it throw light upon the point we are considering, that Christianity does not become identical with the form in which it reveals its presence in the world.

We may make a distinction, in the first place, in considering the spheres of the two. Christianity presents itself here as something broader than the Church, while at the same time it finds always the central sphere of its activity in the Church. It corresponds rather to the conception of the kingdom of God, as set forth in the Scriptures. There are independent spheres or cycles of human life and human activity, all standing of course in the broad idea of humanity, which Christianity as a moulding power reaches, and through which alone they can realize their true end, but which yet, in the present æon, at least, cannot merge themselves into the Church proper. One of these is that of the State. The State may become Christianized—a Christian State, but it nevertheless remains the State. It is subordinate in its aims and calling to the Church, but there is a sense also in which it is co-ordinate in its powers and functions with the Church. The long and varied struggle of Church and State, since the advent of Christianity, and especially during the middle ages, has served to reveal somewhat the nature of the relation between the two, while at the same time it has revealed the error of either attempting to absorb the other, or to claim it as a mere constituent part of itself. Yet there is not just the same difficulty in seeing that Christianity can embrace the state as a proper subject of its moulding power.

Then again there is the sphere of culture, in its broad sense, embracing the two great divisions of science and art, by which our life rises into the sphere of intelligence, and finds a certain freedom from the bondage of mere nature, even "filling the natural with its own thought, and making it the organ of its own will, as in art." Here again we recognize a certain sphere of Christianity, which reaches out, in a certain way, beyond that of the Church. Science may freely become Chris-

tianized, but it does not in the same way, come under the immediate and direct control of the Church, as such. We need to make our distinctions carefully here. Especially must we be careful not to imagine that the Christianity that moulds science and art, impregnating them with its own life, and giving them power to come to their own proper character and end, is something apart from the Church. The Church, as we have seen, is the central sphere of Christianity, its proper home, and it does work upon the world in all its departments through the Church, but it works through the Church as having a wider sphere than the organization in which it performs its chief functions.

The Church, any more than the holy Scriptures, was not appointed to be a teacher of science, and yet it has that which must be received as furnishing the only safe guide, the true principle of all science and art. That is Christianity. The struggle here again between the Church and the interest of scientific, and art culture in the past, and as it still continues in the present, reveals the necessity of making the distinction we have drawn between the spheres of the Church and Christianity.

But, passing from this general distinction, when we come to consider Christianity in its own special and central sphere, the Church, we must also distinguish the two and not identify them. Christianity as essentially life, includes all that is involved in the unfolding of this life. It is Creed, doctrine, law, ethical precept, ordinance, worship, and all these are at the same time constituent elements of the Church. But as inhering in Christianity, they are always more than their actualization and operation at any one time in the Church. It is the relation of the ideal to the actual that confronts us here. The life, or contents, and the form cannot be sundered. In a deep sense, as we have seen, they are one. Yet the life is the fashioner and moulder of form. The form is in the type, and thus cannot be arbitrary, but appears in accordance with fixed laws. The form is in the life, as the life is also in the form, though not measured by it.

In the establishment and founding of the Christian Church, the form was not fashioned externally, nor in all its details, for all time; but the new order of life, with ordinances and appointments, grew into form. The New Testament narrates how during the Apostolic period already the faith, government, discipline, and worship began to shape themselves freely according to the law of life, and under the guidance of inspiration. Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians alike, find a growth or development in the subsequent age, involving great changes in the form of the Church. These are not to be explained by a recourse to oral teachings and traditions, according to which they were all pre-arranged and planned. Even the Roman Catholic (now *Old Catholic*) theologian, Dr. Döllinger, says in his work, The First Age of the Church, "There are no fixed names of offices in the New Testament. Apostles, like St. Peter and St. John, call themselves Presbyters, and overseers; St. Paul calls them deacons; the same persons are called Presbyters and overseers." The idea of the Episcopate according to Ignatius, Irenæus and Cyprian is not the same. The Metropolitan, the Patriarchate, and the Papacy, came as changes in the order of historical development, and not as *jure divino* appointments.

Not only do we find changes in the form of the Church, but in regard to the essential attributes of the Church, Catholicity, Sanctity, Unity, the actual does not at any time express fully the ideal. This is conceded by Roman Catholic theologians in regard to some of these attributes. In regard to sanctity, Dr. Döllinger says, "Therefore she is always holy, because Christ is always sanctifying her, and in Him as her Head, *she always possesses the source of sanctity;* because her indwelling Spirit is the 'Holy' Ghost. However great the power of evil men in the Church, they cannot destroy her *objective* sanctity." That is, the Church has objective sanctity, but subjectively she is only in process of actualizing it. But the same is true of the *Unity* of the Church. She has objective unity in Christ, —this from the beginning, but its actualization comes only as the end of a process, when the ideal shall become fully

actualized. Her Catholicity, too, which involves the full comprehension in her bosom, of all peoples on the face of the earth in organic unity with the Apostolic Church, and also the internal apprehension and moulding of all departments of human life, while it exists always as an attribute of the Church, yet it does not actualize itself, except progressively as it approaches the goal of its destined perfection and completion.

The Roman theory of the Church makes no proper room for such a distinction between the Church as ideal and the Church as actual. It identifies Christianity and the Church,—not only this, it identifies Christianity and the Roman Church. Its unity and catholicity it holds up as the ideal, in the face of the fact that it has been but the Church of the Latin race, in face of the claims of the Greek Church, and those of the Protestant Church which has taken into its bosom the great Teutonic peoples that are the ruling power in modern history. In the face of the history of the primitive Church going before it, of the Greek Church running parallel with it, and the Protestant Church in the modern age, there is something monstrous in the claims of Romanism to possess and exhibit the full actualization of the unity of the holy Catholic Church.

This view of Christianity according to which it presents an ideal which is continually becoming actual makes room for faith in the Church, not only makes room for it, but renders such faith necessary. There is here a hidden power and grace which shines through the earthly and human. As the divinity of Christ was hidden to the eye of the world behind His humanity, which it gradually filled with its glory, and as men could apprehend the mystery of His person only as they beheld by faith His glory—as of the only begotten Son of God, so also it is by faith alone that we can truly apprehend the divine and heavenly as it dwells in and shines through the imperfect actualization of it in the Church. The Romanist demands faith in a unity because it is visible and external. Protestantism challenges faith in the unity of the holy Catholic Church in which it stands, even though that unity is imperfectly actualized.

We stand before the breaking up of the old and the formative workings of Christianity in this new era. The Church seems but inadequately to authenticate the unifying power of her life. We have Roman, Greek, and Protestant, and now another movement looming up in the bosom of the Roman Church itself. Meantime the hosts of darkness are marshalling their forces for a most desperate encounter. As at the opening of the middle ages, when anarchy threatened the whole of Western Europe, when Islam was preparing to fall upon and overrun the Church as the tiger pounces upon his prey, and the Lombards were carrying ruin and devastation over Italy, Gregory, the Great, exclaimed, "What is happening in other parts of the world we know not, but in this the end of all things not merely announces itself as approaching, but shows itself as actually begun," so now many see in the confusion of the present signs of Christ's second coming as near at hand. Yet *that* was really the opening of a period which brought order out of the dismal confusion in the Christianizing of modern Europe. *This* is the beginning of an era for the Church which shall reveal a higher, freer, more catholic unity than that of a papacy sinking into decrepitude.

We know full well that no solution of the problem before us can be found in looking to a Christianity in the clouds. That is to seek for help in a phantom. A liberal and progressive Christianity, so-called, that proposes to move forward against the powers of darkness without a Church is only itself a specious form of infidelity. Christianity is domiciled in the Church, is organically joined with the Church, and must stand or fall with the Church. But Christianity is more than Roman, Greek or Protestant, separately taken, yea more than all combined; and the struggles that now agitate Christendom in all its parts betoken the presence of the mighty Spirit of Christ subduing all things to Him who is the Head of His body, the Church.

Our subject might seem to require that we should attempt to define more distinctly what offices and rights are essential and unchangeable, and what changeable in the constitution of the

Church. This, however, would bring up specific points of controversy which time would not allow us to consider. Our present purpose is answered if we have stated some general principles that are important and necessary for the right understanding of the history of the Christian Church. The truthful interpretation of that history lies, as we conceive, between the two errors to which we have adverted.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

MAN IN THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE A popular Account of the Results of Recent Scientific Research, as regards the Origin, Position and Prospects of the Human Race. From the German of Dr. L. Büchner, author of "Force and Matter," &c., &c. By W. S. Dallas, F. L. S. London: Asher & Co., 13 Bedford Street, Covent Garden. 1872. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

Scientific rationalism in full blast! Worse! the lowest Materialism unblushingly thrust upon the Christian public! Whence is man? He came up by degrees of development from the brute. What is man? He is a cultivated animal. Whither is he tending? To a higher development of his present state of nature. So runs Dr. Büchner's catechism.

Yet it is an able work. The author is evidently well acquainted with natural science in its latest movements and tendencies. In the first part of the book, he presses with much force the evidences of a greater antiquity for man than the chronology of the Bible seems to allow. The scientific facts here stated are certainly important, and we would not lightly wave them aside. Christianity does not contradict nature, though it is above it. The great matter is to properly understand the relation of the two. Science asks Christianity to examine the facts of nature. We say, this is a proper demand. It asks also, that Christianity shall not be so held and taught as to contradict these facts. Right again, we say. If both are from the same God, they must agree. Christians must feel concerned to aid in establishing this agreement.

But now let us turn the tables upon these scientific skeptics. The Christian religion has facts also. It demands that science shall regard and examine these, and seek in the interest of truth to find a reconciliation. This these men will not do. They wave them aside on the ground, that they are impossible, that they are *a priori* not true. Dr. Büchner, for ins ance, says: "And here it may be remarked, once for all, that no man who has subscribed to creeds and formulas, whether in theology or philosophy, can be an unbiassed investigator of the truth, or an unprejudiced judge of the opinions of others." To which it may be replied, that this is simply begging the question. It assumes

that beliefs are foreign to knowledge, that there are no intuitions, no religious nature in man. The only way to meet such presumptive dogmatism, *such* prejudiced opinion, is to use the author's own words against himself: "There is no skepticism so offensive as that, which doubts the facts of honest and careful observation; no infidelity so gross as that which disbelieves the deductions of competent and unbiassed judgments."

Here is a man, who will not deign to notice the well-attested facts in the life of Christ, who lived in the world eighteen centuries ago, and yet wishes us, not only to allow the facts of his "cave discoveries of fossil bones," dating back many thousands of years earlier, but also to swallow whole his own deductions from them!

Dr. Büchner is expected, we learn, to visit New York shortly, to lecture on some of the themes he treats in this book.

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE AND DUTY IN RELATION TO THE CHILDREN OF BELIEVERS. By Rev. H Daniel. Second Edition. Philada.: Reformed Church Publication Board, 54 N. Sixth St. 1872.

This little book is plain and practical. It is also plain and common in the style in which it is published, which is in keeping, we think, with the style of the chapters it contains. For this reason it will sell more cheaply, and, perhaps, find a wider circulation than if it were dressed up in fine clothes. We have looked through it, and it seems to be in full sympathy with the idea of educational religion. It makes proper account of the solemn significance of Baptism, and urges the duty of the proper training of children in the bosom of the family. Its circulation in the families of our Church, and even in those of other Churches, will, no doubt, accomplish much good.

FIFTEEN YEARS OF PRAYER IN THE FULTON STREET MEETING. By S. Irenæus Prime. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872.

Dr. Prime is an interesting writer, and has given in this book a lively and racy account of scenes in the Fulton Street Prayer Meeting. It must not be inferred, however, that there has been no more than fifteen years of prayer on this planet, or that equally interesting results have not attended Christian prayer in all the ages outside of the Fulton Street Church.

A GUIDE TO READING THE HEBREW TEXT. For the Use of Beginners. By Rev. W. H. Vibbert, M. A., Professor of Hebrew in the Berkeley Divinity School. Andover: Warren F. Draper, Publisher, Main Street, 1872.

This book is really what it purports to be—a help for those who may wish to begin the study of Hebrew without the advantage of a teacher. But we think it would be a useful help for the teacher in leading students to a knowledge of the elements of the language.

TRAVELS IN SOUTH AFRICA. Compiled and Arranged by Bayard Taylor. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., Successors to Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.

This volume belongs to *The Illustrated Library of Travel, Exploration and Adventure*, which Messrs. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. are publishing. It is a volume of over three hundred pages, published in the best style, and supplied with excellent illustrations. The continent of Africa has been invested with new interest through the explorations of Livingstone, and the recent expedition under Stanley *which discovered him*. The present volume, prepared by the celebrated traveller, Bayard Taylor, gives an interesting account of the early discovery and settlement of Southern Africa, the journeys of Moffat, Livingstone, Anderson, and Stanley. We have found it interesting reading. It will no doubt find extensive circulation at the present time.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. A Hand-book for Bible Students, by the Rev. J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the Dutch by Maurice S. Evans, B. A. New York: Dodd & Mead, Publishers, No. 762 Broadway. 1871.

It was not until recently this book came into our hands, though it has been before the public for some time. It is needless to say, that it is able and thorough, although it is condensed for the purpose of bringing it into the compass of a text book, for use in theological seminaries. After the introductory sections giving a definition of the science, its history, method, &c., the author takes up the *First Part*, the Old Testament Basis in Mosaism, Prophetism, Judaism, and John the Baptist. In the *Second Part*, we have, 1. The Theology of Jesus Christ in the Synoptists, and then separately in St. John. *Part Third* treats of the Theology of the Apostles, the Petrine, Pauline, and Johannine. *Part Fourth*, the higher unity, or a harmony, &c.

That there is such a thing as Old Testament theology, in distinction from Dogmatic theology, is evident to all who have a proper conception of the last. In this country, the distinction has not generally been made. For some years, Old Testament theology has been taught in the Seminary of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church. It is expected soon to provide for a course in New Testament theology. Much more can be accomplished by a division of labor, than by mixing up things that do not properly belong together.

The author's view of inspiration, to which exception was taken by the *Christian Intelligencer*, some time ago, is expressed on page 191. "The distinction between the theology of Jesus Christ and that of the Apostles, is the fruit of a sounder view as to the inspiration of the sacred writers. From the stand-point of the mechanical theory of inspiration, it was entirely a matter of indifference whether a text of Scripture was to be found in the Old Testament or the New, proceeded from the Lord Himself or from one of His witnesses—enough, it was in the Bible. A mode of dealing with Scripture more in accordance

with historic principles, prepared the way for a juster distinction, which, without doubt, is according to the Lord and His Apostles." It must be clear at once, that no Apostle could give expression to the wholeness of Christianity as Christ does, and his inspiration does not destroy his peculiarities as a man. Hence, we have many books in the New Testament, so that the revelation may be presented from different sides. Even in regard to the life and teachings of Christ, we have the subject presented by four evangelists, where this life is viewed from different stand-points. Besides, in any one evangelist, we are to distinguish between the teachings of our Lord Himself and that of the Evangelist. This does not lower our view of inspiration, but rather enables us to view it, not as mechanical, but as free. We may return to this subject in a more extended notice of this work of Dr. Van Oosterzee hereafter.

THE FATHERS OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. Edited by Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A. M. Vol. III. Lancaster: J. M. Westhæffer. 1872.

We have received advanced sheets of this forthcoming volume. It is no doubt known to our readers, that Dr. Harbaugh had collected material for this volume, but was prevented by death from publishing it. The Synod appointed Rev. D. Y. Heisler to edit the work, and he has done it successfully. The editing involved a great deal of labor, for the manuscripts were found to need a good deal of revision, and a considerable amount of new matter had to be prepared. Mr. Heisler has done this work as a labor of love, receiving no compensation. We understand that he has ready also another volume of his own, which will speedily follow this.

Dr. Harbaugh used to say, that the first two volumes of the Fathers were *printed*, but not *published*. Their circulation was very limited. The Church has an opportunity now to do proper justice to the labors of Dr. Harbaugh, and also to those of Mr. Heisler, by giving a wide circulation to these volumes. The copy-right of the first volume is placed in the hands of Mrs. Dr. Harbaugh, which fact will no doubt add to the sale of the work. But independently of this, it seems to us, a proper love for the Church, and respect for the memory of its deceased ministers, should lead our living ministers and members to secure these volumes. They have intrinsic merit. These ministers were, for the most part, men of good attainments; they were faithful laborers in our Reformed Church, and the story of their lives is well calculated to inspire those who still live and labor in the same Church.

Among the new works to be published during the present month, we are promised, by *Scribner, Armstrong & Co.*, the third volume of Dr. Hodge's Theology, and the second volume of Ueberweg's History of Philosophy. The first completes a work which we have already briefly noticed. The second will give us the history of Modern Philosophy, and we look for it with much interest.

3 1198 04015 1495
N/1198/04015/1495X

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

3 1198 04015 1495
N/1198/04015/1495X